Mental Evolution

U. GRANT KING

Class

Book

Copyright No.

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

MENTAL EVOLUTION

BY

U. GRANT KING

Mr. Darwin deals with Material in his work on Evolution, which is Physical or Natural growth. While we are agreeable on this, it is only aimed herein to deal with Thought, which I contend is Mental or Spiritual growth.

The work consists mostly of the definitions of Biblical words on a Scientific basis, rather than a Religious theory based principally on belief.

The most important of these words are God and Satan, which I argue are Thought; that "The Soul" is Sense, and "The Resurrection" is Knowledge.

BOSTON
THE ROXBURGH PUBLISHING COMPANY
INCORPORATED

BR126
.K52
1921

AUG -1 '21

©CLA624001

no 1

Copyright 1921
By U. GRANT KING
Rights Reserved

PREFACE

It is customary in this age to mention the parents, birth and University schooling of a person seeking and holding high positions in the different walks of life. (What a fearful drawback custom and form are to development.) We suppose it is done with the belief that such mention in the papers about the birth, etc., will have a tendency to place said person in a higher estimation with the community at large tho it ought not to do so. It reads something like this: "Mr. Smith was born at Albany, New York, of highly respected parents. His father was a Professor in the University of Michigan, and a member of different societies. Mr. Smith graduated at Ann Arbor, and then entered the law business."

We find many who have graduated from this or that school, yet their lives have and do amount to much less than some of those who have had but a common school education; besides, it should not be considered that the former have better brains and thinking faculties because they have graduated from some University. We regret in a way that all cannot have a College education, and yet such does not fit man for every occupation of greatness in life, tho we are in the habit of laying, or may lay such as the foundation of the future of man. It is said "Herbert Spencer's aversion to linguistic studies put a University

career out of the question. At the age of seventeen he entered the office of Sir Charles Fox and began work as a civil engineer. About eight years afterward he gave up this position and devoted the whole of his time to Scientific experiments and studies, and to contributions on philosophical questions to various periodicals."

It need not be said by me that Mr. Spencer has furnished us with wonderful truths along the line of Philosophy, because those who have read his works know this. It was not because he had believed such and such was the case thru a customary teaching and belief, but because he knew from practical and experimental methods, that such and such was the actual truth concerning such things. It is the belief of the average person, or minister, or priest, that if a person enters a Theological Seminary and studies with the "belief" that such and such is the case in regard to truth in the Christian life of man, that such persons are better qualified for the ministry of the Actual Truth, whether experience and observation have anything to do with making it a Truth.

It is amusing to read the objections offered by priests and ministers against those who give interpretations of words written in the Bible, because the latter have not been thru a Theological Seminary, when these same ministers and priests are supposed to receive their lessons from Jesus who never entered a Seminary, nor even had a common school education. But we cannot expect anything else from such persons, when we take into consideration that the same feeling

existed in the same time of Jesus, by THE SAME CLASS TO-DAY. They said then and to-day—, "Is not this the carpenter's Son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren James and Joses, and Simon and Judas? Whence then hath this man all these things?" We can liken the Theologian of to-day as was Nicodemus in those days when "he answered and said unto him, How can these things be? "Jesus answered and said unto him, Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things? "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness. "If I have told you of earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?"

Jesus was no scholar, but the son of a tradesman, or "a carpenter," and should not according to the priests: know "such things" concerning a Religious life to the extent of teaching it. He was considered by the "chief priests" and so-called learned men as "beside himself," just as all men who advance a new idea.

Most all Scientific propositions were and are considered by the majority to be the result of "un-sound" thinkers, or that they are not sane ideas. The chief priests remarked as much about Jesus when they said "he is beside himself." The Darwin theory has been looked upon by many as an "insane Idea," because it was not up to the "belief" of a Religious idea, but now we find many of these same persons who agree with Darwin, since they have changed their belief for things that have been proved to be so, altho contrary

to their Religion. Therefore, we can consider the following remark made by Herbert Spencer as worthy of mention here, as approved by one wishing to be heard, the ideas that may seem to be advanced.

"Whoever hesitates to utter that which he thinks the highest truth, lest it should be too much in advance of the time, may reassure himself by looking at his acts from an impersonal point of view. Let him duly realize the fact that opinion is the agency thru which character adapts external arrangements to itself—that his opinion rightly forms part of this agency—is a unity of force, constituting, with other such units, the general power which works out social changes; and he will perceive that he may properly give full utterance to his innermost convictions: leaving it to produce what effect it may. It is not for nothing that he has in him these sympathies with some principles and repugnance to others. He, with all of his capacities, and aspirations, and beliefs, is not an accident, but a product of the time. He must remember that while he is a descendant of the past, he is a parent of the future; and that his thoughts are as children born to him, which he may not carelessly let die. He, like every other man, may properly consider himself as one of the myriad agencies thru whom works the Unknown Cause; and when the Unknown Cause produces in him a certain belief, he is thereby authorized to profess and act out that belief.

"Doubtless whoever feels the greatness of the error to which his fellows cling, and the greatness of the truth which they reject, will find it hard to

show due patience. It is hard to listen calmly to the futile arguments used in support of irrational doctrines, and to the misrepresentation of antagonistic doctrines. It is hard for him to bear the manifestation of that pride of ignorance which so far exceeds the pride of Science. Naturally enough such a one will be indignant when charged with irreligion because he declines to accept the carpenter-theory of creation as the most worthy one. He may think it needless as it is difficult, to concede his repugnance to a creed which tacitly ascribes to the Unknowable a love of adulation such as would be despised in a human being. Convinced as he is that all punishment, as we see it wrought out in the order of nature, is but a disguised beneficence, there will perhaps escape from him an angry condemnation of the belief that punishment is a divine vengeance, and that divine vengeance is eternal."

The people believed the priests then and now because of their Seminary training, yet, Nicodemus could not understand how "Ye must be born again." It is to point out herein that it is thru Thought that man is to be born again, and that Nicodemus looked to a Natural impossibility instead of a Mental possibility. I shall not aim to, as most writers who disagree with Darwin in some respects to associate a Religious belief of creation along with that of Natural development. Having compared what it says in the Bible with experience and observation, is to know by such that the life Jesus taught is the Spiritual life to be here lived, altho he too because of the early age in which he lived could not live the fullness of the Christ life he taught.

The conditions of life are continually changing, irrespective of what the individual has believed, and to believe in all what Jesus said as to what concerns a life hereafter, is as unreasonable as it was for Jesus and Paul to believe even in any part of the Old Testament. Paul said, "for their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament, which veil is done away in Christ." The "OLD" and "NEW" are but the history of the lives and experience of those who lived in those days—the experience and observation causing certain prophecies to be made, and since a lower intelligence only develops by comparison to a higher intelligence, we can readily understand why each following generation is partially due to the prophecy of the former generation. The view, that remarks made in the Bible seem contradictory, only illustrates the selfish and non-selfish view of the authors, yet, in their Scientific meaning, they are not contradictory. Self, or selfishness is derived from nature, and can only have its existence in the flesh, and because of nature being a part of our existence we naturally look towards a selfish view of life, and so the creeds as a Religious body have failed to diagnose the Truth because of their own selfish view. A lie is the Truth until it is uncovered, and then another lie fills its place as the Truth, so goeth Religion. Religion is but a theory on Truth and called Scientific because of "things learnt," and naturally so "believed," instead of believed thru experience and observation as Jesus alluded to when he said: "O ye hypocrites: Ye can discern the face of the sky: but can ye not discern the signs of the times?"

THE AUTHOR.

INTRODUCTION

The subject under consideration is of vast importance, but no doubt is the least understood of any theme brought before the public. I shall not expect, nor even attempt to persuade all readers of these narratives to believe the same, as it could barely be expected at this period of the game, since Time is required to work out the problem of, and Perfection of Being; however, a reasonable hearing shall be asked. The subjects are treated with as much respect to other writers as my Conscience will permit, and if I am too aggressive to the most stereotyped Religious Creeds, it is not more so to the same class as when Jesus said "O ye hypocrites."

I have only expressed myself from the experience and observation of things, which two essentials are the qualities necessary to form a Science of any Truth, and the same Jesus went thru in order to teach what he did as a result of this experience. And what is the Science of anything, but that Knowledge is duly formed by experience and observation as all Phenomena? Tho Spencer was not able to see this Truth as regard to all Religion in Phenomena, he gave much in regard to it, else he would not have alluded to an "Unknown Cause," or to the "Unknowable," as we shall find herein is a Known Cause, or is Knowable.

Herbert Spencer says, "There has ever prevailed among men a vague notion that Scientific knowl-

edge differs in nature from ordinary knowledge. By the Greeks, with whom mathematics—*literally things learnt*—was alone considered as knowledge proper, the distinction must have been strongly felt; and it has ever since maintained itself in the general mind. "All knowledge is from experience," holds M. Compte, and this I also hold to, hold it, indeed, in a wider sense than M. Compte,—since, not only do I believe that all the ideas transmitted by past generations are thus arrived; but I also contend that the very faculties by which they are acquired, are the products of accumulated experiences received by ancestral races of beings (see Principles of Psychology). Nor am I aware that M. Compte accepting this doctrine, has done anything to make it more certain, or give it more definiteness. Indeed it was impossible for him to do so, since he repudiates that part of Mental Science by which alone this doctrine can be proved."

We find that Religious belief changes from one Truth to another, because built upon Theory, or "*things learnt*," and continues to ask in the words of Pilate, "What is Truth," while Truth continues to exist as a Truth regardless of a certain belief, and will be Known "by its fruits"—experiences in life. A great religious faith was practised before Martin Luther stepped upon the threshold of a doctrine he too had believed, but the Conscience of a God or Thought came to him in a more reasonable light than he had experienced in his former belief, and so to-day and thruout the ages, man has and is gaining a better knowledge of what the word God implies. Therefore it

is only doing justice to man, that man speak according to his Conscience, rather than to uphold a theory and laws which have always worked in some degree contrary to development. Martin Luther in speaking of Conscience, said: "unless I be convinced by scripture and reason, I neither can, nor dare retract anything, for my Conscience is a captive to God's work, and it is neither safe nor right to go against Conscience." I add: this is true in the meaning that God is Thought, which is Thought's work, or "God's work," and that the "Conscience" of a thing to-day may not be the Conscience of a thing in the past, if it be so that the Conscience is conscious of a different view of life and more in harmony with development, or is evolutionary in its meaning, just as Luther held a different view or became conscious of a different life than what he had been living.

Judging from the immoral conditions of the world, we can see very little advancement towards a more moral state of things, altho religions abound in great numbers. Nor can we say with precision that all the morality is due to the doctrines of the different religions, since man is to be awakened to the fact that he must develop with Good, or God as Thought, in order to reach a Higher State of Life.

A very dear Catholic friend of mine once said: "Catholicism was the first and is the oldest religion, and why should it not be the only light to Truth?" I replied: "The candle was once the most perfect and natural form of light in the world, but to-day we have gas and electricity, and would you wish to return to and use the can-

dle because it was and is the 'oldest,' or used before the electric came into use?" Progress is a universal law working, and while all things exist having Principles and nothing having a real existence concerning functions on Mental problems without a Known Principle, we can readily see the falsity of anything to advantage unless used as such. Anything "Unknown" is no Cause to an end. Electricity has its Principles; Mathematics has its Principle, and we must know the Principle of Mathematics, else the true example cannot be worked, and it cannot exist as a true example without its known Principle, therefore, any "hidden" thing has no existence as a living Principle.

I do not claim any original idea beyond what some others have written in regard to heaven, but I believe I have drawn away somewhat from their idea in giving the definition of God and Satan as Thought, the Soul as Sense, and the Resurrection as Knowledge. The same idea and same words are repeated herein quite often, but it is done with the aim that you may be able to understand more thoroly, also because of many Bible quotations being of a repetitional nature require repetitional interpretations of a like nature, so I trust you will overlook the many iterations, besides, they are liable to carry more weight along with the sentence wherein they are written. Neither have I confined myself to each subject thruout as a compound idea of explanation, since subjects of a different nature are a natural acquisition in drawing out to perfection each subject.

MENTAL EVOLUTION

GOD AND SATAN ARE THOUGHT.

> "For it is God which worketh in you," as also it is Satan which worketh in you in opposition."

The reason I have set out to use the Bible quotations as a forerunner to the subject and the finality of the whole, is because I believe they are significant of the Evolution of Thought from Genesis to Revelation. It is readily for me to conceive the idea, and I shall endeavor to point out the fact that Consciousness did not exist prior to Genesis, or that Genesis is "THE BEGINNING" of a State of Consciousness as to Morality and Immorality—"Good and Evil"—God and Satan—and as to what may be termed Thought in applying it to use as to distinguish likeness and unlikeness. But the greater point of fact to be brought out and of which the Bible quotations can be used, is because it so relates more to the life of man, and it is to confine the subject of THOUGHT to the Spiritual life of man, tho thoughts of all nature and meanings may be associated in the life of man. And when speaking of the Spiritual life of man, I do not confound such a word with any future life, nor one separate from this life, but as coexisting in this life, and therefore define the word Spirit as a synonym to the word Mental,

or that Spirituality is nothing but Mentality, and neither refers to an individual life, but is the individuality of the meaning of a unity, and so not indivisible, only as an individual meaning. It is my intention to so disassociate God with the Natural form of Creation, so as to prove that God did not exist prior to Creation, and therefore is a Cause Known instead of an "Unknown Cause," and to be Known as a Creator, or a Thought as Cause, or Cause as Thought, which could not Cause any existence known as matter, because It is not of a material nature, and, since things only can exist by what they consist, so God could not exist as the Cause of Nature. There being nothing in Nature in the likeness of God other than by MAN-ifestation of a State of Consciousness called Thought, so It can only Create things conditionally, and finally change or Cause a different Creation. So there can be no such a thing as a God, other than Thought, and there is no such a thing as a Satan, other than Thought, therefore God is a Cause as a Creator, or is a Re-Creator as the words of Jesus implies, "YE MUST BE BORN AGAIN." The word "again" is significant of a different Creation, or that there must have been something in the nature of being created BEFORE a thing could be created "AGAIN." The word "ye" as used in the sentence is significant in its meaning as applying to all generations and to the idea that man is to be born again, since no man in the then and following generations has reached the State of Perfection, or as Emerson puts it: "If John was perfect, why are you and I alive." It cannot allude to any SET OF MEN as some would have

us believe because of their own selfish views, and so refers to man in all generations as that Thought which is to change not the form of man, but the bodily conditions of man—natural conditions pertaining to the body, and then shall exist the Perfect man as Paul says: "First that which is Natural, and AFTERWARD that which is Spiritual." Also the fact that God was not the Creator of the "NATURAL MAN," as Paul said: "Howbeit, that was not first which is Spiritual, but that which is Natural." If, according to the general opinion, and I agree that it is true that "God is a Spirit," how in the name of Reason could Spirit Create Material things, and then be opposed to what It Created? as it is referred to by "the Spirit is against the flesh." Granting that Paul believed in a Spiritual body separate from the Material, which was easy in that generation as it is even so now, it is unreasonable that it is true, yet, his words here only signify that the Natural existed "first," and in time is to be replaced by a Spiritual and bodily condition, and that God could not exist prior to the Natural condition. Jesus said "Behold the hour cometh, yea, is now come that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone: and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me." In other words, none of the disciples could accept the teaching and live it, because of their, or "his own" creed or doctrine, therefore is "every man scattered to his own." But why did Jesus say this? Because he knew that it required time in which to put it in practise as well as to believe it possible, just as other men of Science have failed to make people believe

facts they have proved to be so. The meaning of the word "alone," or Jesus as Christ was alone, was because the Spiritual or Mental Thought as God or "Father" was MAN-ifested by Jesus only as regards to a more Spiritual life then. The word "Father" is significant of that which antedated the time of Christ as Spiritual or Mental, just as the natural father antedated the life of Jesus as physical or natural. In other words: Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary, but Christ WAS and IS the "Son of God." The same Idea-Christ is alone and will be alone until "ALL MEN" are "EVEN AS I AM," which signifies the Universal Life of the One-Christ. Here the word "Son" is but the individual meaning of a Whole or Unity called God, Father or Thought, and therefore "the Christ" as a Mental conception of life as it refers to the same where it says "I and my Father are one," and not that Jesus was any part of God, other than MAN-ifesting the seeming individuality of the Whole. There never existed a prophet so thoroly familiar with the idea of the development of Thought as Jesus, because he lived it almost incessantly, and by this experience knew that the Mental or Spiritual Life was and is superior to the Physical or Natural Life which is to be reached thru God or Thought of the same.

His prophecies will be fulfilled to the letter in the Sense that the Spiritual life as the Highest form of life is the end to be reached, and we are becoming more acquainted with the exact Truth he taught and the words spoken, altho many times in parables, than our progenitors. In Genesis 3: 22 it Says,—"And the Lord God said (Man

became conscious and thought so) Behold, the man is become one of us, to know Good and Evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever," he shall have little part in life above the physical, but be as "the ground from whence he was taken." We read in John 3: 3—, "Jesus answered and said unto them, Verily, Verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." You will note here with me that it does not say, "Ye must be born again" as in another passage referred to, but, except a man be born again, which is in keeping with the idea I have heretofore explained, or that it does not refer to you and I as the individual living in the past or present generation, but that it will be so when the past and present natural conditions shall cease to exist as Paul says,—"So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."

These three passages should lead us to believe that only thru the understanding of an Eternal Principle termed Thought, and the work thereof, shall man be able to reach the Perfect Idea or Christ of Life. The first thing then that confronts us, is to know the Principle, in order to commence rightly. To offer as an illustration, we will take mathematics as an example. In order to add two and two, we find there is a Principle to know, and when we have learned this, it is easy to add two and two and receive a correct answer. So also it is easy to work with God when we understand the

Principle of Thought as God. Since the fundamental truth of Thought is Mental—Spirit, it stands to reason that only the derivative can be a mental product, and in order to do this it is possible only to work thru evolutionary methods along Mental lines by associating the Higher elements of Thought in Consciousness, that it will become so Visible in the Spiritual Sense. It is the general opinion of man that he should pray to God, or that there is a God to pray to, in order to overcome different things of the world, when we ought to know that a condition cannot be overcome unless that condition is changed, or it is to be changed thru the Power of Thought. If you were going to add two and two, you could not conceive an answer by praying to the Principle of mathematics,—you cannot move nor change the Thought or Principle of anything by praying or even wishing it to be so, since existing conditions in regard to re-creation are the products of a living Principle developed so. Then, in order to receive "the answer," the man must be changed thru a Principle, and not by looking up to that Principle. We have lived according to, or have recognized two living Principles of Thought, and so we arrive at two conclusions, or manifest them in the form of "Good and Evil," and this is why we have believed in a God and in a Satan. "Ye are of your Father the Devil," because you are of your Thought the Evil, or manifest the Evil Thought, but when "I and my Father are one," you manifest Good or God, which Jesus referred to when he said, "YE are not of the world, even as I am not of the world, I and my Father are one." This could only allude

to Thought, since any separation is individual, and, of course, would still leave a chance to conclude in a Personal God or a Creator of the Physical.

Spencer says, "We know nothing more of existence than a continued manifestation" which ought to convince any unbiased mind that there can be no other existence, tho we may "believe" in something concerning another life because taught so by one who has had no experience in another life, therefore no authority for the same. Manifestations of Reason, Intelligence, Good and Evil, are Mental manifestations thru the Physical, while the body Physical is the manifestation of Nature and so the existence is known of both Physical and Mental by manifestation. "You are of your Father the devil" or of this or that, may lead one to believe they are OF this or that, which is incorrect, but is a term applied in order to distinguish the individual from two conditions, or that they manifest one effect as a result of one Cause, and manifest another effect as the result of another Cause, and so are OF one or the other, but should not leave the impression that they are OF either as an offspring, but that you are God and Satan. Again: in dealing with other thought, we hear people say, "I thought that," when it is a fact that only the thought presented itself as to that or this. You never think of anything independently, but because of something which may involve that of existing conditions, or as to what may change these conditions, so you embody this thought as an individual, since, other individuals would embody these growing conditions if you did

not exist as a body during the same period and location. Neither does a thought at the same time always present itself alike in two persons, because these persons are sitting at different angles at the same time. I will also argue the fact that you do not act as individual Thought as Cause, else you would be responsible hereafter for what you thought as an individual, which of course is the religious theory that you suffer or enjoy hereafter for what you do in this life, when you are not the Creator of either "Good and Evil." But it is not to dwell on thought as to things in life generally, for it is the aim only to prove that God and Satan are "Good and Evil" Thoughts as is illustrated in "Genesis," and Thoughts being Mental, they are both Spirits, for it says "There are good and evil spirits." In regard to general thought, Herbert Spencer quotes Hegel by saying:

"Now, if we believe with Hegel, first, that thought is the true essence of man, second, that thought is the essence of the world, and that, therefore, there is nothing but thought, his classification beginning with the Science of pure thought, may be accepted. But, otherwise, it is an obvious objection of his arrangement, that thought implies things thought of—that there can be no logical forms without the substance of experience—that the Science of things must have a simultaneous origin. Hegel, however, anticipates this objection, and, in his obstinate idealism, replies that the contrary is true; that all contained in the forms, to become something, requires to be thought of, and that logical forms are the foundations of all things.

"Mankind find themselves unable to conceive that there can be thought without things thought of. Hegel, however, asserts that there *can* be thought without things thought of. That ultimate test of a true proposition—the inability of the human mind to conceive the negation of it—which in all cases he considers valid, he considers invalid where it suits his convenience to do so, and yet at the same time denies the right of an opponent to follow his example."

To take the stand that "there can be thought without things thought of," is to hold the view that thought is nothing, since, if we find things are thought, and thoughts are things, then, in the name of Reason, how can other thought exist? But I contend that thought only exists in the form of things by name created out of material in Nature, and that Nature is but a growth thru the evolulutionary process of atoms coming in contact and forming things in their natural order, because Mind or Thought did not exist prior to Nature, since Consciousness as to Good and Evil and the naming of things did not exist during the elementary states of natural Evolution. Nature can only be related to the Natural Law of Evolution, while God can only be related to the Spiritual Law of Evolution. If God or Thought created rain, etc., then Science in Astronomy is without any foundation in fact, yet thought of the same is significant that it is thought. So God is not a "FIRST CAUSE," but an existence due to development—making the Evolution of Thought simultaneous with the Evolution of Nature, and making it possible for the Thought as a God to control the

organic or natural life accordingly as it develops in Power by demonstration of Mind over matter, because matter is unable to demonstrate this ability. In his work on "Science, Philosophy and Morals," Mr. Spencer quotes Mr. Martineau on Evolution in the following:

"The first definite objection which Mr. Martineau raises is, that the hypothesis of General Evolution is powerless to account even for the simple orders of facts in the absence of different numerous substances. He argues that, were matter all of one kind, no such phenomena as chemical changes would be possible; and that "in order to start the world on its chemical career, you must enlarge its capital, and present it with an outfit of heterogeneous constituents. Try, therefore, the effect of such a gift, fling into the pre-existing caldron the whole list of recognized elementary substances, and give leave to their affinities to work." The intended implication obviously is, that there must exist the separately-created elements before Evolution can begin.

"Here, however, Mr. Martineau makes an assumption which a few, if any, chemists will commit themselves, and which many will distinctly deny. There are no 'recognized elementary substances,' if the expression means substances known to be elementary. What chemists, for convenience, call elementary substances, are merely substances which they have this far failed to decompose; b ut, bearing in mind past experiences, they do not dare to say that they are absolutely undecomposable.

"Mr. Martineau next alleges that a fatal difficulty is put in the way of the General Doctrine

of Evolution by the existence of a chasm between the living and the not living. He says: 'But with all your enlargement of data, turn them as you will, at the end of every passage which they explore, the *door of life* is closed against them still.' Here again our ignorance is employed to play the part of knowledge, the fact that we do not know distinctly how our alleged transition has taken place is transformed into the fact that no transition has taken place. We have, in a more general shape, the argument which, until lately, was thought conclusive—the argument that because the genesis of each species of creature had not been explained, therefore each species must have been separately created.

"Thus the reply to this objection is, first, that there is going on from both sides a rapid narrowing of the chasm supposed to be impossible, and, second, that, even were the chasm not in course of being filled up, we should no more be justified in therefore assuming a supernatural commencement of life than Kepler was justified in assuming that there were guiding-Spirits to keep the planets in their orbits, because he could not see how else they were kept in their orbits."

I here use the above quotation merely to point out the fact of opinion based upon Religion, and one based upon Science. Men of religious views have invariably been antagonistic to Evolution because they could not associate their religious views with Evolution. But religious views are continually changing, and therefore should prove that the change is due to Science based on the law of Evolution. There will be as great a change in

regard to a Spiritual Life, as there have been changes made in regard to organic life. The truth in regard to man as well as other conditions of life have advanced greater in the past few years than it has for many previous years, because of the discovery of America, since, advanced thought, nor any progress cannot be made to advance when it is arrested as it was before America was discovered.

Darwin, in quoting from Galton, says: "There is apparently much truth in the belief that the wonderful progress of the United States, as well as the character of the people, are the results of natural selection, the more energetic, restless, courageous men from all parts of Europe having emigrated during the last ten or twelve generations to that great country, and having there succeeded best."

We can hardly agree with Galton, that progress is due directly to "the more energetic, restless, courageous men" emigrating from Europe, unless we also agree that men were GIVEN A POSITION in which to express themselves MORE FREELY after landing in this country. It matters not, how "courageous" people are, if they are not allowed freedom of thought and speech, because bondage will necessarily arrest the thinking faculties to some extent. We have no cause nor even a desire to think for ourselves, if we are told, or supposed to believe that ONE MAN, or even a few shall do the thinking for us, which was and even now is the popular religious belief. To make my sentiment more clear on this point, we will bring two very important incidents together

which will concur with my statement, and that the progress of the country is as much due to the more FEARLESS KIND, as to the "energetic" as referred to by Galton.

"In 1492 Columbus discovered Trinidad, and the mouth of the Orinoco, and landed at Paria, on the coast of South America. After these discoveries, Columbus steered for Hispaniola where he found everything in disorder. The king's ear had been again abused, and an officer named Bovadilla had been appointed to supersede Columbus as governor, and by this person Columbus was sent home in chains. The spirit of adventure, however, which had borne him up amid so many disappointments, was not to be crushed by injustice. It still burned bright and strong as ever within the great old man who, on the 9th of May, 1502, with four vessels and 150 men, set out once more to seek a passage uniting the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, which he imagined lay somewhere between Honduras and Paria.

"In 1505 Martin Luther took his degree of Doctor of Philosophy, or master of arts, when he was twenty-one years of age. Previous to this, however, a profound change of feeling had begun in him. Chancing one day to examine the Vulgate in the University Library, he saw with astonishment that there were more gospels and epistles than in the lectionaries. He was arrested by his newly found treasure. His heart was deeply touched, and he resolved to devote himself to a Spiritual Life."

In taking these two incidents seriously into consideration, it cannot but impress us with the

idea that they were to bring about a complete change of venue in the world of thought, not only in the religious feeling, but in other matters as well. No doubt but the thought advanced by Luther, which is now partly in error thru more progressiveness, would have died with its author, had there not been a chance to express—"water"—it more freely than in the country in which he lived. This chance you will note came with the discovery of America, since it was about that time when the people were well under way to America, and the more "restless," and especially the FEARLESS kind could advance their ideas more freely. This also illustrates the fact that we cannot much hinder development in any form. The saying, "I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world," also proves that the final Truth concerning the Christ as the Idea of life to be lived, was inevitable in the time of the Adamic Era, and that it was not understood in the time of Jesus, nor is it hardly conceivable at present. It is "secret" simply because it had not developed into a State of Consciousness as acknowledged by and known by Jesus, tho it could have been brought to light by any person under another name, as well as that of Jesus.

All Power and Cause have been attributed to God as a Being, thru custom or usage, tho God as Thought is Power. Power and Cause can be and is attributed to Satan because such Thought is Power, yet it should not be used as such. Mind and Thought co-exist with matter, and cannot be known and exist without matter. But matter can exist without Thought or Mind, which proves

that Creation in the form of Matter did or could and can exist without Mind, which proves that Creation in the form of Matter did or can exist without a God as Creator. Thought is founded then, by what exists in the Phenomena, or there can be no existence of Thought but as it is seen in the Phenomena. We can only form a different opinion in Thought by different things existing in the Phenomena. If my opinion as to what is right has changed, it is because what had appeared to be a fact has outgrown its usefulness by other more reasonable ideas forming the one idea as to a more exact Truth in its Phenomena. The reason the Thought as to the change in Religion is so, is because the present Phenomena of our existence is the result of a Thought outgrown by what had appeared in the phenomena as so. All our little seeming individual thoughts of things as they differ with other individuals are but the result of opinion brought about by what appears different to one or the other in Phenomena, which difference is due more or less to the changed state being changed by lack of growth as the case may be in the individual being at one time or other associated differently with things in Phenomena. Thought then, must in time outgrow matter, as when matter which has fulfilled its growth by the development of Thought will be much less in existence since it will only be an acquisition in the form of Thought to express Thought as it is to-day, much less in power as a Physical body, because of the mental growing more in Power as a Mental body. Thought is not individual just because it exists in the individual Conscience, since the terms

"Good and Evil" (God and Satan) are ALIKE in all individuals. An Evil is an Evil whether it be in your Conscience or in mine, therefore IT IS NOT INDIVIDUAL, but is a Unity of Thought, or a Whole expressed by individuals and can be called a "Son" of either God and Satan.

Before mental faculties were developed, there was no such thing as God and Satan. The term God has been applied to Creation when that of Abiogenesis and the Biogenesis of life should be used. It has been only since thought developed, that such a thing as "Good"—God could exist, or such a thing as a Knowledge of "Good and Evil" —God and Satan—could exist. We also read this state of consciousness in Genesis as to man being able to name things in nature, saying: "And brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them; and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof." We should realize the fact that there is no existence besides that which exists as visible, either in the Physical or as the Mental. It is unreasonable that a Spiritual and Natural world, or that one condition which is SUPPOSED to have existed, and still exists UNKNOWN or BACK OF THIS, will, when the visible or what is termed this Natural existence shall have finished its course, be known then, and EXIST ALONE as the Spiritual. Such hypothesis of two worlds existing are ridiculous, when taking the objective-matter as a necessary acquisition to hold up the objective-spirit, if the Spirit is at present wholly Absolute. (i. e.) If what is termed the Spiritual, did, or could exist before what is termed the Visible or this Natural, and does

NOW EXIST, and then CAN EXIST ALONE, after what is generally termed the destruction of this world; IT SEEMS UNREASONABLE THAT THIS WORLD SHOULD EXIST AT ALL. So then there could have been no "First Cause" for material in the form of Creation, since Creation would have had a Cause to Create it, when it simply developed thru atoms in contact, because it could not be an Effect without a Cause and could have no Cause because it could not spring from the absurd idea of "NOTHING," as the author refers to in the first part of Genesis. We hear people say, "What was the world created for," or, What did God have in mind when he created the world?" It could not be otherwise than what it is, nor otherwise than what it has been. All of this "noise" is the result of selfishness derived from the individual view of life, and therefore not Scientific. Jesus was selfish and non-selfish at times, and so we read the TWO WORLD view from his selfish view and not from a Scientific point of view. When he lived after the flesh, or had natural desires, he could hold selfish views since passion hath no time for Knowledge, just the same as all nature is shown in all of us more or less—less selfishness in him, especially "after the fast," because he lived then away from the world, and therefore held more the Higher Thought—God of Life.

It is highly conceivable then that God did not exist first, neither did Satan. (Man did not exist first, and man being even as it says, "the image of God," so neither could exist first.) So, God and Satan being Thought, so the NAME MAN is this

Thought by MAN-ifestation since the time of the Adam and Eve Era, because of "the beginning" —"Genesis" of a Knowledge of two lives—one Higher and the other Lower—Good and Evil"— than was known by the animal and primitive man. What may be termed solids, or material and therefore being a form of substance, was all and is all that could and can fill space in the form of life. (Principles need no space—God and Satan are these.) So what may be termed the Abiogenesis of life received its initial step from the mass or matter, but when that step was taken and finished, then that was the end of Abiogeny as to one kind of existence, because that which is termed the Biogenesis of life was here developed.

"Heat is a form of Motion." We know Heat causes matter-material to expand, which is more than likely that heat could account for, and has had, and does have much to do with giving life, which here may be termed the Abiogenesis of life, for, if particles or atoms of matter were thrown out by "Heat" by way of expansion, and therefore cause in matter what may be termed life because of "Motion," and thereby come in contact with other particles or atoms of matter thrown out by "Heat" by way of expansion; is it not possible that such could produce Action and Life? If, according to Darwin, and I must agree with him that man evolved from a monkey, it stands to Reason that the monkey evolved from a lesser animal, and so on down to the first stage of animal life, and even to nothingness. We can get this illustration from the evolution of light. Commencing with the candle as light, next we receive

light from kerosene, then the gas and then the electric, which all contain one or more of the same elements in producing light, yet, a much different FORM of light. It is said, "birds of a beautiful plumage have been placed in a different or wild country than where they were born, and there changed to a different plumage." This again proves that environments and the different localities and the substance along with forces in those localities have much to do with the different forming of life, and the life of one, and not that a Being termed God is the Cause of such a bodily form of existence in the natural way.

In the following quotation where in his "Recent Discussions in The Sociological Disagreement, or Reasons for dissenting from Comte," Mr. Spencer gives in his "Science, Philosophy and Morals," the very like view I take in regard to organic life and its functional associations, saying: "And now let me point out that which really HAS exercised a profound influence over my course of thought. The truth which Harvey's embryological inquiries first dimly indicated, which was afterward more clearly perceived by Wolf, and which was put into definite shape by Von-Baer—the truth that all organic development is a change from a state of homegeneity to a state of heterogeneity—this it is from which very many of the conclusions which I now hold, have indirectly resulted. In SOCIAL Statics, there is everywhere manifested a dominant belief in the evolution of man and of Society. There is also manifested the belief that this evolution is in both cases determined by the incidence of conditions—

the actions of circumstances. And there is further, in the sections referred to, a recognition of the fact that organic and social evolutions, conform to the same law. Falling amid beliefs in evolutions of various orders, everywhere determined by natural causes, (beliefs again displayed in the THEORY OF POPULATION and in the Principles of Psychology), the formula of Von-Baer acted as an organizing principle. The extension of it to all other kinds of phenomena than those of individual and social organization, is traceable thru successive stages."

How many thousands and thousands of years it required to develop man from the first moving atoms or particles of living matter will never be known, nor is it necessary. Consciousness could here begin to develop with what may be termed expansion of matter, since such expansion required expression of Action or "Motion." Again: Consciousness may have developed with what we term touch, which would naturally bring about some feeling of expression, for touch is recognized thru cohesion, as a match produces light when it strikes its opposite with force. All the while Consciousness developed more and more until creatures became upright—man the most of any, and so the thought developed into a State of Consciousness, and gave man the name "image," because he appeared to this Conscience to be the creation of some Being. Such a Conscience in those days could easily hold the idea of some Being, or what is termed God and Satan, but as the Thought developed, so did the Conscience conceive the idea of how things could be created out of the material

existing. It was then, too, according to the "Genesis" mentioned in the Bible, that the conscience became Conscious of two conditions of life as to the moral and immoral character of man, for, this is the Real God and Satan and Thought in a different form of life and mentioned here as "Good and Evil." "Good is the Anglo-Saxon term for God," as in the words of Jesus, "there is only one Good and that is God," or there is only one God and that is Good. If you ask me, "do you believe in God, I reply yes, because I believe in Good." If you ask me, do you believe in A God, I reply no, because there is not a kind of Good, any more than there is a kind of Truth or God. The word good and bad may be applied to material things, but when referring to God as Good, that applies to Mental or Spiritual things, in the Sense that doing an act of Good is an act of God in the form of Spirit significance.

Therefore, the Adam and Eve Era is the "Genesis," or, "the beginning" of "the world" of Consciousness as to the Sense—Soul of Good and Evil, and so does not refer to Creation on a material basis. You claim that "God is Good" (this is correct when you conform it to the idea of Good) should by that very assertion be reasonable enough to acknowledge it does not conform to matter, because it is not material, and therefore could not Cause creation in the form of matter, and, since, creating such pests as insects and the like would not be in harmony with what we should now term God or Good, or in fact any animal life which we know even as man is brutal, would be contrary to that which is Good, and therefore contrary to

God. It is often remarked, "God created these pests, etc.," to punish man, when Love or Truth cannot issue anything contrary to Love or Truth, since, "Ye cannot gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles." Did you ever stand by and watch the innocent horse being tortured by the insect? Must the horse suffer because the man did a wrong? It is here evident that you should be familiar with the fact that the insect, like every other specie, is but fighting its own battles for an existence—this is natural and sometimes brutal, even as it is with man to man, let alone the beast that knows no law of social function.

Jesus said "it rains on the just, and on the unjust." This remark only illustrates results from natural causes, and the fact that man is subject somewhat to that which he is naturally related to, and how impossible it is to avoid existing conditions. These things occurring have been attributed to "the fall of man" since the days of Noah. The fall of man is a myth, for man has risen ever since he became Conscious of two conditions of Thought, or, if he had not become Conscious of these, he would be like the animal or primitive man; therefore the FALL only illustrates the difference between these two conditions—the Higher and Lower. It would also be absurd for man to destroy the things in Creation, if God created them, yet, man is inventing all sorts of things by which he can kill and destroy not only all animal life, but man also. So then, each thing is made individual by individual usage, and may be termed Spirit or Thought in its relation to the Creation concerning man to rise above the organic or

Natural life of man. It is claimed that there are two Minds—one good and the other evil. There can be but one Conscience, or even one Mind, but the term two is used and understood to be so because things are expressed in two forms of life—good and evil. The same Machine will produce a good and an inferior article, therefore not the fault of the Machine (Conscience) but the materials used. No two thoughts—Good and Evil—can occupy the Mind at the same time. That Thought is Power, and Power is also Thought, is Expressed in every action or moving Machine, for "Thoughts are things." The hammer is raised thru the knowledge of how the Machine should be constructed to raise and let fall the hammer. But God is the Thought concerning a Higher or Spiritual Life over and above the Natural or Lower Life of Man, and should be but the One Thought in order to reach the Perfect End, as Jesus said "ye cannot serve two masters." Let me quote here some similar idea of Spencer.

"As the progress of Thought is one, so is the end one. There are not three possible terminal conceptions,—but only a single terminal conception. When the theological idea of the providential action of one being, is developed to its ultimate forms, by the absorption of all independent secondary agencies, it becomes the conception of a being immanent in all phenomena; and the reduction of it to this state, implies the fading away, in thought of all those anthropomorphic attributes by which the aboriginal idea was distinguished. The alleged last term of the metaphysical system—the conception of a single great

general entity, NATURE, as the source of all phenomena—is a conception identical with the previous one: the consciousness of a single source which is coming to be regarded as universal, ceases to be regarded conceivable: differs in nothing but name from the consciousness of one being, manifested in all phenomena. And similarity, that which is described as the ideal Science—the power to represent all observable phenomena as particular cases of a single general fact, implies the postulating of some ultimate existence of which this single fact is alleged, and the postulating of this ultimate existence, involves a state of consciousness indistinguishable from the other two."

Man is then—not looking at him from a Natural point of view—but the Expression of the Good and Evil Thought, and not Perfect as Mrs. Eddy says "God made man Perfect," because the Perfect Thought or God is not Perfect, or Wholly conceivable in the consciousness and therefore not Visibly so, but ultimately there shall be the Man as One Thought or God. It is because we have held in consciousness the idea of two ends—Heaven and Hell—that the one cannot reach its finality, tho it shall not be the selfish view of a locality, other than here as a locality. So, if to-day we shall look to the one end as to the Mental or Spiritual Idea of Life to be reached as the final end, that end shall be reached, just as the end of the Natural formation reached its end when man developed. Man as he is to-day, cannot live after death, because we cannot express either Thought—Good and Evil—after death, for Thought or Spirit is Life in the Visible form of life concerning

man. Neither can the Machine which expresses action—Life, do so after it is out of repair or destroyed, but the Idea is expressed by another Machine of the same making—form—and perhaps an improvement, just as man is improved in character and the like by the Higher Evolution of Thought.

The word "we" is often used when the word "man" should be used in speaking of the Universal Truth concerning the life of men, because any looking to ourselves as a final end or future is a selfish view. Mrs. Eddy says "the time is coming when WE shall not live to eat, nor eat to live." I agree the time is coming when man shall not live to eat, but, man in the form of WE and others during the Natural condition shall eat and die so long as the Natural conditions exist, since, WE are only forms of life concerning now two conditions—Physical and Mental or Natural and Spiritual, or working according to the development of Thought, since "Ye are as sheep for the slaughter."

"Man shall not live by bread alone," illustrates the growth of the Higher Thought—God—during the Natural existence, until finally—the end—the Natural condition is overcome. And "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." (i. e.) Thought is not the work of the dead, because the Thought cannot work in a dead form. When you say as Mrs. Eddy and the general religious view that "we" live forever, is a case where "belief" does not make it a fact. While "I and my Father are one," this does not refer to me as an individual, but that "I am" God as long as I

Express Life as God, or I and my Thought are one, which cannot be Expressed by me after what is termed death, but that Life continues to exist as Life in other individuals as God. You have the Thought or Spirit to be Good or God, and you have the Thought or Spirit to be Evil or Satan, and therefore are you both God and Satan—"Good and Evil," or "One of Us." The past and present religious belief of a God to pray to, or that man is not as it says in Truth a God, is why we fail in having less power over things of the world, just as the boy who always looks up to a father for help and support is unable to master things. But when we realize the fact that he is of the same making, he will not look up to a father, but look within himself to find the same talent and power. I shall be "stoned" for claiming I am God, and that you are God, just as Jesus was stoned when he aimed to illustrate the same idea. as in the following will prove it is the Truth. "Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him. Jesus answered them, 'Many good works have I shewed you from my Father, for which of those works do ye stone me?' The Jews answered him, saying, 'For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.' Jesus answered them, 'Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods?' " In other words: if I address you, or a single person, is it not just as reasonable for me to say you are God, as it would be to address a number of persons and say "Ye are gods?" Here again in pointing out that God is Thought, and Thought is Man, or that Man is God and Man is

Thought is because the terms are applicable in the sense that if I act according to what I think, it is because I act according to Thought and am Thought or God because of this. If in opposition I act accordingly, then I am Satan, as Jesus refers to when he said "ye are of your father the devil." The animal cannot be a God, nor a creation of God because it knows nothing of and cannot think morally and immorally, but acts according to a feeling derived thru the brain and nerves, and not from what is Thought. To say that "God is the same yesterday, to-day and forever," is in error from the very fact that even religious views of God have gradually changed, besides, It could not exist as Perfect in "the beginning," since Perfection in anything is reached thru growth, tho the Principle of Thought or Thinking may be Perfect. "*Vox populi vox Dei*" can be termed proper, and also that the voice of the people is the voice of Satan.

We have thru custom applied the words God and Satan to different things and causes, when it concerns only us as to two states of life. We say "God caused the lightning," or, "Caused it to rain," or Caused it to bring about earthquakes, drought, or that or this, when EACH have their own law existing because of certain existing conditions. We are under the same law in a way as are other forms of organic life, but are placed above certain conditions, because Thought conditions things to a different environment. We are affected somewhat by the rain, etc., because of OUR ASSOCIATION with them and because of some like material in our construction, and not because God and Satan have anything to do with

it. It is only natural that that part of us which is derived from the same source as other things, shall in like manner be treated as such, or, "return to dust." Both God and Satan can be attributed to what are termed the Spiritual and Natural, because there is no other way by which we can explain two conditions, or Spirit and matter. But, both should in the term of Spirit, refer to the Mental, or work from the Mental, since the Cause of one brings a like Effect, and the Cause of the other brings a like Effect in regard to a better and worse condition of life. The animal life existed long before these existed, and does now exist so, and man being the same as to the Physical, also, exists the same. I wish here and always to ignore the word "Invisible," only in explanation, since, such a word has and will leave the impression that there exists two worlds. This is the reason other writers have failed to see the "Unknown." They are more liable to believe in two worlds, or that there is a visible and an Invisible, or that a Thought may have existed prior to its appearance, because they say it was "First the thought and then the spoken word." This idea, too, has caused the belief that the Thought and Word are separate, and, therefore that God and Man are separate. Man has and does believe in two worlds because he has believed that Spirit referred necessarily to some Invisible thing called God, while Matter applied to or referred to the Visible things called man and beasts. They can be used as such terms because there is no other method by which we can explain TWO conditions in ONE life, or, to use the words of Spencer: "We can only speak of

matter in terms of Mind, and we can only speak of Mind in terms of Matter." The Thought was and is just as much a word as when Thought or spoken. Nor, can one exist prior to the other. Just the instant a Word is Thought, just that instant does it become a Word, therefore they are not separate, only by verbal usage, nor are there two existences, and knowing this, there cannot be anything "Unknown." "The word was made flesh," signifies that the Thought cannot be Expressed by other than Matter. Jesus said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also," because the Thought is Expressed or Man-ifested by the form of Jesus as "the Father," and therefore is a Known Cause, and not an "Unknown Cause." It is reasonable then to believe we can work more perfect if we know the Cause. It was not that there existed a Being or Personality in the form of man as Jesus appeared. Not that Jesus was separate, or an individual, and therefore a "Son," but that the life he Expressed was in Unity with the "Father"—Thought of a Higher Idea—Christ of life than the man can express while living after the Lower Idea—Adam of life, therefore, "the Christ." Jesus was not that Christ, not "the Son of God," only in the term that he taught the Idea—Christ, and was therefore looked upon by his followers, and called "the Christ." Jesus was no more than You and I, because he spoke the Word of God—both God and Word are One—and not a Word from God or of a God. So then, a Son of Thought is a Son of God, which cannot be so in Nature, for in Nature, man is a son of man. Because, now, and since

"the beginning" of the Spiritual Law is working "side by side" with the Natural Law; man is leading a Dual Life. The Spirit is called Spirit and Invisible because it is not really individual, but indivisible and exists as Thought from one generation to another. The word Spirit can be applied to Satan as well as to God, for both work as the Mental, since the Evil is Spirit or Thought when it is acted—Visible. I aim to continually argue and remind the reader that the Evil or Thought and the Act are but ONE existence. It is easy to understand why Jesus had more of a conception of the Ideal life. Thought growth is by sowing, just as much as nature produces more than its equivalent by sowing. Because he made more of a study along the line of Metaphysics, so was he in a position to receive more of the development of Thought. After he had received the fullness thereof, he began to sow, but because of the brute or animal nature that predominated in his time, it was impossible for the Mental faculties to develop, and to reap much of a "harvest." It still continues, because "the flesh works against the Spirit," or the "Natural man" looks and studies more of nature than he does of Spirit. To-day, we read more along the lines which treat of the Physical than of the Mental. We are continually "treating" the body. And it is no wonder, since we care more to live "after the flesh" than "after the Spirit." When we get the idea out of our Natural Consciousness that "God created man," or that he was and is "PUT HERE FOR A PURPOSE," etc., then, and not until then will the growth of Thought be more universally lived.

"The harvest is ripe, but the laborers are few." "God is a Spirit and they that worship him, must worship him in Spirit and in Truth." So is Satan a Spirit, but man is told not to worship—be conscious of HIM in spirit, for, concerning God it says: "The hour cometh, and NOW IS, when the TRUE worshippers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in Truth," or, not only in Spirit, but in Truth, and not in Error. Paul said, "Beloved, believe not EVERY SPIRIT, but try the SPIRITS whether they be of God." In referring to God and Satan, or Truth and Error, Paul said, "We are of God: he that knoweth God, heareth us; he that is not of God, heareth not us. "Hereby know we the Spirit of Truth, and the Spirit of error." You will note here with me that "Spirit" refers to both "Good and Evil, or Truth and Error, while most religious writers claim that Spirit refers to God only. Again, "Now we have received not the spirit of the world"—Evil and Temporal—"but the Spirit which is God"—Good and Eternal. This places the Idea or Adam with Satan, and the Idea or Christ with God, when concerning the life of man as Thought, but not in Creation. The form or shape of man is not to be changed, but the character and condition, and understanding these as Thought and Power, it is easy to understand how man is to be "BORN AGAIN." To claim God is the "First Cause," is to place the evil conditions and all deformities in nature as the Effect of that Cause, which to me seems very impossible, since, Truth cannot produce its opposite, or Error. I repeat, that there was no "First Cause," since Thought as Cause is Derived from conditions that

exist, and can have a Cause to change these conditions, which former conditions of matter had no cause before Thought developed, but existed as material substances. This idea you will note, also, does not place either God and Satan as the Cause of the other. Neither is the Higher Evolution of Man due to going back in search of his origin as atoms of matter and organic life, but to hold in Conscience, or be Conscious of that which pertains to a Spiritual Life only as the One to exist forever, for, he can never be "born again" by looking at the material point of life.

We are to-day coming more into the knowledge that the Bible is but a history and chronological data of words which presented themselves to the Conscience of man only in keeping with a generation in which they could be applied as such as having their part with the lives of man in those days, therefore, are not the words of a God as a Being. In other words, each generation is lived according to the knowledge of God and Satan, and NOT because "God said" this or that. God said that or this because man thought—the thought presented itself as to this or that concerning God, since God could only be known as the conception was known to exist, or, as their belief in a God. In other words: It was they who wrote and spoke as they believed they had heard and understood —being of a more brute and animal nature, they had more of an idea of a Personal God than we of to-day. Of course, there can be no other God than as he is seen thru belief, since God to that man is the exact image of what that man believes, since, belief is all that man can live by, yet, it

may not be the Truth. We have more Gods today, because we have more beliefs, that is, more conceptions of what God is like. But there is but ONE GOD, and, have they seen "The Father," who claims this or that belief?

The Old Testament contains much of "God said" so and so. As the generations pass, there is a marked opinion and diversion noticeable as to what these words in the Testament signify, which interpretation of the same has given rise to many popular religions. Such a diversion and drawing away from beliefs is evidence that they are all a matter of opinion, or not a certainty that any of these conclusions are correct. It is only thru experience and observation and time, regardless of any former belief proved to be wrong, that a final conclusion can be reached. "Ye can discern the face of the sky," because you look only on nature, but ye should "discern the signs of the times," because not only nature should be considered, for, we are learning by "the signs of the times" that nature has played too prominent a part on the life of man. Asylums of all description are being erected for the purpose of those who are so unfortunate as to be the offspring of the lower self. In trying to build up man, we have failed to impart the law of Thought which has Power to build up or to destroy the Physical conditions. We have "believed" too long the "old doctrines" because they were said by "well read men" to be facts. Many a lie has been thought and accepted as a truth until it was uncovered. The disciples said many times to Jesus that they "BELIEVED," yet we find "he rebuked them for their lack of

UNDERSTANDING," which is proof that it is not only in the "belief" of a thing, but the "understanding" of that thing which gives it its rightful position.

So then, it is clear that the doctrine of a certain creed, or ANY CREED not holding the SAME VIEWS TO-DAY AT EVERY POINT as it held in THOSE DAYS, are not reliable and authentic, and therefore subject to ridicule. The different remarks in the four gospels are also evidence of how true it is that every person does not entertain the same view of a remark or subject given or lectured upon, else there would not be such a diversification in the sayings of the four apostles. The Old Testament is responsible for the lack of growth along the line of Religion, and as to any advanced ideas. We to-day ought to discard it altogether, and I dare say it will not be long ere the New will be unnecessary in order to understand the facts on ethics. The minister quotes more from the Old than the New to-day, which is significant that the "natural man" in his way still predominates in the majority, and this is why the Truth along religious lines of the Spirit or Mental is not developed more universally. I cannot understand why for so long a time ministers have evaded the remark by Paul, who, so many years ago understood the possible hindrance of a Higher Evolution because of studying things outgrown. He said, "But their minds were blinded; for until this day remaineth the same veil, untaken away in the reading of the OLD TESTAMENT, which veil is done away in Christ." "Even unto this day when Moses is read, the veil

is upon their heads. Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away." In the New Testament, the "veil is taken away"—A BETTER UNDERSTANDING IS VISIBLE because "the veil" of MISUNDERSTANDING "is taken away." The "New" is the Christ as the Idea of Life, which view has been and is obstructed (veiled) by reading and studying the "OLD" or Adam as the Idea of life. The "Old" illustrates the "Natural Man," and the "New" illustrates the Spiritual Man. Paul said "The natural man knoweth not the things that be of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned." (i.e.), The natural man looks at the physical and natural view, and so cannot accept the Spiritual or Mental view, or it is mentally "discerned" instead of the physical as the life here to be lived, and that the Spiritual is to be lived in another locality.

The Old Testament obstructs Progress as to the True Knowledge of what God is, just as the Progress of a child would be hindered in advanced studies, if it continued to read and study the primer. To-day the ministers and priests object to the "modern" interpretation of words written in the Bible, but we can imagine how modern these same words were accepted by the same class in the time of Jesus. God and Satan then, are two Thoughts of life working to an end which no man—"not even the Son"—can fathom, other than that Truth is Imperative when Error lessens its command, for, Satan has not as yet been worthless, (the Lower condition must always be proved so

by the Higher), for, as it says "while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them." In other words, there is no one but what has some evil and good—"tares and wheat"—in them, and evil cannot be forced as the "reformers" would have it moved, and as Jesus here illustrates when the same class wanted to move the "tares" from the field. They, "the reformers" have "tares" of another existence in them that should be removed, and would object if another body attempted to remove their likes, for such proof can only be made thru the law of Evolution as the above quotation illustrates, and not necessarily removed during the natural life of some individual.

In the following I give the definition of derivatives, and that things as Unities and Trinities are relatively Synonymous.

Spiritual Law	Natural Law	Universal Law.
The Spirit;	The Word;	The Truth.
The Father;	The Son;	The Holy Ghost.
The Invisible;	The Visible;	The Comforter.

The Spiritual simply signifies an Eternal existence, and the Natural a Temporal existence, and a Universal Law because of the co-operation between the Physical and Mental being necessary so long as the Material is necessary in forming the continuity of the Thought of Life. The Spirit is Spiritual; the Word is Natural and the Truth is Universal because of the Unity. The Father is The Son and The Holy Ghost because a Unity, tho in the form of a Trinity because of the same Universal Law. The Invisible is the Visible in the form of "The Comforter" as Universal.

In reference to this Unity of Thought I here again quote the words of Jesus. "Ye are not of the world, even as I am not of the world; I and my Father are one." The word "even," as used in the sentence is to place just a little variation between Jesus and man generally, that is; in speaking of this Unity of all men as one and Jesus also, he says "ye are not of the world," and "I am not of the world," by adding, "I and my Father are one." It, of course, appears that Jesus referred to himself only, because of the then and now theory based upon a religious belief of a Creation by a God who had created man and other living things, and later seemed to feel sorry for what He had created and so "sent his Son" to make a change. But the above quotation magnifies the idea into a more reasonable definition when we associate all as a Unity, in that here Jesus makes no distinction between himself and others as to being differently created. Therefore, he is no more a Son than others, yet, more so, or "even" more so because of his unequaled understanding of that Unity called Spirit above Matter.

The word "Christ" in the New Testament is synonymous with the word "Image" as used in the Old Testament as far as the Unity of life is concerned, or, Christ refers to the Unity of the Spiritual or Mental life, while Jesus refers to the Natural or Physical life as the "Image" and both are synonymous to the word Idea, because both are an Idea of life. Idea is the definition of Image given by Webster, and taking this definition as true, I will give my definition of the word Idea by way of an illustration.

An Architect planned a building to be erected, therefore an Idea, but not necessarily the building. The building was destroyed by fire, but the Idea still continued to exist, for, a dwelling was soon replaced after the same Idea; and you will agree with me that if the Idea had been destroyed, the structure could not have been rebuilt the same, and agree also that it could not be rebuilt from the material destroyed by fire. Now, Man—the Spiritual or Mental Idea or Christ, or God, or Thought will exist forever; but Man—the Physical or Natural having not lived as the Christ because of the past and present Material conditions, can no more exist or return to life after death, or continue to exist in another locality, than the material used in the construction of the building, after it is destroyed by fire, since, Man or You are but presently the embodiment of two Ideas known as Adam and Spirit—Jesus and Christ, and therefore subject to two conditions of life—Physical and Spiritual, or Natural and Mental.

Because I have referred to the Architect as having an Idea of creating or planning a building, it might be construed from such that the meaning would infer that God is a Being or Person with an Individual Mind having an Idea as to man. The Architect is but a form by which the Idea is able to develop, just as man is a natural form by which the Thought of Good or God can develop. The term "mind in man" gives man the Creative idea, therefore an idea that man is the IDEA "OF" GOD, or SEPARATE from God; when man is an individual term for God, since this God or Thought could not exist—be known—without the form of

man, any more than the idea of the building could be known without the materials used.

In speaking again of God as Cause of this or that, we will refer to Geology which has a law of its own. Mr. Mallet says, "Volcanoes, and the centers of the earthquake disturbances, are near the sea, or other large supplies of water: and that when an eruption of igneous matter takes place beneath the sea-bottom, the first action must be to open up large fissures in its rocky material, or to lift and remove its incoherent portions, such as sand, gravel, mud, etc. The water on meeting the heated surfaces assumes the spheroided state; while in this condition, the intestine motion may be great, but little steam is generated; but no sooner have the surfaces cooled, than the water comes into closed contact with them, and a vast volume of steam is evolved explosively, and blown off into the deep and cold water of the sea, where it is condensed, and thus a blow of the most tremendous sort is given at the volcanic focus, and being transferred outwardly in all directions, is transmitted as the earthquake shock. On the surfaces again becoming heated by conduction from the molten mass, the various phases are again repeated. This is the chief CAUSE of earthquakes, but they may also be due to the evolution of steam thru fissures, and its irregular and per-saltum condensation under pressure of sea-water; or to great fractures and dislocations in the rocky crust, suddenly produced by pressure acting on it from beneath, or in any other direction."

We can conclude from the above quotation that the rain, snow, etc., have their law in nature, as

well as the earthquake. Jesus said in regard to Evolution concerning man on a Metaphysical basis: "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Jesus could not allude to any following generations, nor know the actual Form or Truth of such conditions which might develop, since, "no man knoweth, not even the Son," what shall be, yet he could and did prophesy what might be the result of Truth as he saw it by "overcoming the world"—sexual indulgence. Thought, being a growth along Mental lines, it could not predestine, and so "the Son"—Individual—Expressing this Unity of Thought could not know the actual end. So then, God is the God—Thought and work of Abraham, yet, NOT AFTER DEATH, but the Thought and work of Isaac, yet, NOT AFTER DEATH, but the Thought and work of Jacob, yet, NOT AFTER DEATH, but the Thought and work of "THE SEED" following these generations, since life cannot exist as the Spirit either for Good and Evil where death exists, or in a dead body, which as it says cannot be "resurrected."

So then, there is but one course to pursue, and therefore the duty of every man is to be Conscious of the Higher Thought, in order that the Spirit of Perfection will become a Visible possibility. Any other view is selfish, that is, if we look to ourself as an individual result, we are holding the wrong Idea which is natural and ends in death

because it belongs to nature. Emerson wisely says, "those who live to the future must always appear selfish to those who live to the present." Mrs. Eddy says "Man is Spiritual and not Material." I claim every man is as much Natural (I prefer to use the word Natural, as Paul does, instead of the word Material) as he is Spiritual, if he is Conscious of both in the same proportion, and so too because of both conditions existing. If he holds but the One Idea, "I am Spiritual," then he is holding to the Truth of an Eternal existence, and will develop more in harmony with the Spiritual Idea than by holding to the two Ideas, or, you will not be serving "two masters." This mortal—flesh Idea—can only "put on immortality" as Immortal Thought is Thought. I agree that Man—the Idea or Christ of Life is "Spiritual" or Mental and Eternal, and not "Material"—Physical. Jesus avoided the Thought concerning Nature almost continually, yet, there are evidences that he did not do so incessantly, or live the Idea—Christ of Life entirely, nor could he in that age any more than we of to-day. However, his teaching always referred to the Higher Life. The Natural is according to Nature in its relation to the Material or Organic life existing as a condition, and CERTAINLY NOT OUTGROWN, therefore it cannot be a sin to give up to these desires. This is why, in the words of Jesus, "they had not had sin," and so we have no sin in ourselves—individual responsibility—for, there is no sin for man, only in the form that sin exists in the form of man, and the Natural is contrary to Spiritual growth, as referred to by the remark: "the flesh lusteth

against the spirit." Man—You are not responsible because "the flesh lusteth against the spirit," but subject to whatever the conditions may be thru the Thought as it works in you; whether "for good" or whether "for evil." Jesus was only "human" and experienced the same, therefore, Christ is not an individual or Jesus, but an Idea of life, since Christ could not exist in Paul if it were a FORM, for, Paul said "CHRIST LIVETH IN ME."

In Genesis 2: 21-22, it Reads: "And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept, and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh thereof. And the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man." If taken metaphorically, this is as absurd as the remark made to a child when a birth has taken place in a family, "the doctor brought it," and WE LIKE CHILDREN HAVE BELIEVED IT. But, here again, I claim that the first part of the book of Genesis illustrates the first state of Consciousness, as to morality and immorality and the beginning of Reasoning, and the above quotation proves that man was ignorant as to Creation in those days. The word "sleep" signifies this, or that HIS EYES were not opened to the facts of Creation, and also proves that Adam was not AWAKE to the fact that woman, or Eve, was his "HELPMATE," or of an opposite sex, for, before this state of Consciousness had developed, they were as ignorant of male and female sex as the different types of animals, or like them, except in form—having no Thought and Consciousness of Right and Wrong

—Moral and Immoral—"Good and Evil"—God and Satan. The above chapter also denies the statement below in regard to making ONE from the OTHER. It says in Genesis 1-27, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; MALE and FEMALE created he them." Also, "Heaven and the earth, and all things of the earth, and lastly man and woman, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply." This last remark also contradicts the idea that any one sins, or, that Adam and Eve sinned. In fact, the author was at "sea" about Creation, and the different and contradictory remarks illustrate ignorance. "The eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked," illustrates they had now received a much higher knowledge of life than the animal, or natural way of appearing, therefore a Sense of things morally and immorally. The same nude fashion exists to-day under the name of "High Art." It is amusing to read the objections offered, and by those very same persons upholding art, of such forms placarded on show bills in even less form of nudeness, yet, the tendency to suggest immorality or the animal and brute nature is more evident in high art than the other. This nudeness and immoral suggestion can be seen in the "art windows," and like all immorality under a name, as in Religion some things are overlooked and tolerated, so is this nudeness in the name of art respected. One Editor on commenting on this, or, as he writes: "because we come into the world without any clothes on, it is no more than right that we should be more true to nature and overlook the nudeness,

and be just as morally inclined, even if we do appear in a nude fashion, or as nature made us." I cannot understand how we could come in the world WITH ANY CLOTHES ON, nor why, because of this nudeness of nature we should not advance above the BRUTE in the clothes proposition, as well as any other occupation and Science. This should open our "eyes" to-day, to the fact that all such parts should be covered, because we are living in an age when suggestion has much to do with moulding the life of man, and our "civilized" methods seem to place us in a different attitude toward each other even as nature intended, or as lived by the less civilized and animals. It is the women who generally "make up," and if I believed as Mrs. Eddy says, and some others about being "tempted," I should say from experience and observation, that it is the women who "tempt" the men. Hallie Ermine Reves did not realize how true she spoke when she said she "believes that each gown she owns should reflect some particular mood or flash of thought." Each dress is the result of some thought, and the wearer must also reflect some such "flash of thought" during the time of wear. Now, just the fact that man navigates erect, or upright more than the beast, is sufficient evidence that those parts should be covered. So we have persons, according to remarks by some, who would return to DEGENERACY, or the BRUTE, just because IT WAS and IS a natural condition, or because "we come into the world without any clothes on." We can overlook the "babe," for, it too, signifies ignorance and the

animal, since it creeps and goes about like the animal, and is not Conscious of either "Good and Evil," or, is significant of the same condition as Adam and Eve before the Thought developed to a Knowledge of God and Satan.

I remember on my summer travels in Pennsylvania when going thru the poorer districts of the mining towns, especially the more illiterate and foreign settlements, of seeing women almost nude and nursing infants, which reminded me very much of an old sow and her little pigs. Now, this is according to nature—the brute part of it—and if people call this a part of civilization, then I wish to disown civilization. If men and women would appear at home more like they see each other before marriage, there would be more respect held out for each other, since, environments Cause conditions of Thought, as well as Thought Causes a condition of environment. It is when you appear "untidy," and in a loose garment and the like, that the respect held out for each other before marriage begins to wane, because you appear more like the animal or brute nature, and the finer sense of taste and morality disappears at such a sight. This position is much like or characteristic of the sporting house. In this position you are more apt to try and satisfy the sensual appetite, which finally causes the feeling of dis-satisfaction, because one or the other cannot hold out to the full desires of the other, or brute nature, and like the brute or animal you wander off to satisfy this appetite in others, which finally ends in divorce and disaster for one or the other or both. Much is written about "the evil of men," and "the

goodness of women," from what the author believes is so, whether they have had any experience or not in these things; making observation alone the foundation. A good woman would naturally write about the goodness of woman. One lecturer said, "When you find a fallen woman, you will find a man back of it." Granting that a man was a party to it, we can hardly conceive the idea that the woman had no voice in the matter, since it always requires two to make a bargain, and generally one or the other is loser. A woman who wishes to retain her virginity, will not sell her character to gain a living. I cannot agree with those who demand higher wages for women, that such will make better women. Money does not make one morally better, in fact, it is generally the source thru which a character is ruined, since it places one in an easy environment where the condition of one's life is more liable to be changed because of the want of something better to do, or, as one may say: "If you do not work, the devil will." If we study life as it is, we shall find that the tendency to-day, and according to the Darwin theory is to gain a living thru the easiest way, or avoid as much as possible any hard labor, just like the animal that wanders thru the forests. You seldom find a hard worker, a bad character, in fact it would not be characteristic of such, since, they know it would be much easier to gain a living by the immoral way. The evil is generally more seen in men and by men because it is "customary" not to be so hidden and disrespected as it is by women. It is more open to-day among women, because woman is more independent of man to-

day, and not because as some write, it is a "growing evil." Things are more "open" to-day because of the error coming more in the light than in the past, and not that it is worse than in the past. When women become more on an equality with men, or have "equal rights" in all things as they shall surely have, then will she be more independent of man and so be more respected by man and like men, and will not care what is said of her character than what is said of man's character, and one shall not be respected nor disrespected more than the other. I believe in "equality" here as well as in many things, and I claim that the Evil may be as strongly impressed in the Conscience of woman as in man, but FEAR TO USE IT, withholds her to some extent. If woman HAS BEEN, or IS BETTER, it is because SHE HAS PROFITED BY THIS FEAR, and NOT BECAUSE SHE IS A WOMAN.

When this Conscious State of Thought—"Good and Evil"—developed in Adam and Eve, we read the argument which came up between them. I call it an argument because it simply illustrates this in the following: "And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree and I did eat. "And the Lord God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me and I did eat." Mrs. Eddy has very wrongly grasped the true meaning of these two verses. She points out that the woman, or Eve, "admits here" that it was "the serpent" who tempted her instead of the man, while the man claims—as she points out—"the Woman tempted

him"—Mrs. Eddy making it appear that the woman—so she says, "IS MORE JUST THAN THE MAN," because Eve did not say "the man tempted her," just as if in that almost brute generation they could recognize any given qualities or unequality, when such requires years thru growth and knowledge. I will be more considerate, and as it says "JUDGE NOT," and place both man and woman on an equal footing by scientifically explaining IT WAS and IS neither the man as the individual cause and independently working, nor the woman as the individual cause and independently working that did and does do the tempting. It is the Evil Thought—"Serpent"—which tempts the other. That is, the Evil of one tempts the Evil of the other, then, the Evil or Thought is performed by both. Therefore, these two quotations refer to the forms of both man and woman, or, the remark made by Adam that "the woman tempted" him, signifies that man and woman embodies "the serpent"—Evil which tempts, and the remark of Eve that "The Serpent beguiled me," signifies "the Serpent" which man and woman embodies, or, the former remark ilustrates the body in the form of Spirit, and the latter illustrates the Spirit form of the body. "Judge not, lest ye be judged," illustrates it is the Good and Evil working, and that no man and woman should condemn another, or say as Mrs. Eddy refers to, that one is at fault more than the other. Jesus always avoided the individual when speaking in a scientific sense, but used the individual term when rebuking those whom he addressed, since, it could hardly be ex-

pressed otherwise. In order to explain away the idea that God refers to a Being, or a Spiritual Being, or the "Unknown," I will use the word Thought to replace that of God in the common Bible quotations, and also reverse the sentence in order to show the Spirit significance of the word Thought as an Expression of MAN-ifestation. It says "God is Love." So, Thought is Love, and Love is Thought. "God is Good." Therefore, Thought is Good,and Good is Thought. "God is a Spirit," so, Thought is a Spirit, and Spirit is a Thought, because neither are material, and, in fact, all terms applied to the Unity of anything Mental, is metaphysical and not Physical.

To preach and hold to the Thought of both Good and Evil, Heaven and Hell, as in general Theology is why we cannot destroy the Evil and Hell—both being ideas—since, the Evil and Hell will continue as long as they are recognized. Recognition of anything is the life of that thing. To remove anything by force, other than by a method gained thru study and talent, is to weaken that talent and study in man, since man becomes unfit to cope with any obstacle in his way. Man only becomes man above the brute when he can say "I am master of the appetite." To remove the saloon, or anything created by education and form as a habit must be destroyed by an opposite education. Just as long as the "Movie" pictures the immoral suggestion, under the guise of showing up "sin," or "the underworld," just that much longer will immorality live, since, the Evil in man will associate with Evil when it is produced in any form, and so cannot destroy its own by continual-

ly appearing as it does in any Movie or Play. So then, the only way to destroy a thing is not to further its recognition, because, as long as Evil things are Thought and talked of, they will exist. That the sexual, or "flesh" indulgence is the only real Evil and of which Jesus alluded to continually as a "sin," which retards spiritual growth is here significant by the word "Serpent," because it is the most loathsome and lowest type of animality. In the same chapter, and of which I have made mention of heretofore, it says: "And the Lord God said, behold, the man is become one of us, to know Good and Evil." Here we find that man, tho he was man in animal form heretofore, he now became ONE OF US, or Good and Evil—God and Satan. This also contradicts the idea that a certain man at one time, or that man as he lives today is condemned or not hereafter, for doing that which he was and is unable to avoid under the then and even now existing conditions. Since KNOWING THEM, he is either condemned or not to that extent he is Conscious of them NOW. Meredith wrote: "We can live without love, what is passion but pining, but where is the man that can live without dining." This is not the "love" referred to in the Bible, for one is to satisfy self and passion, while the other refers to the act of Good—God in man. When the disciples said, "Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?" Jesus replied, "Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him." This illustrates the fact that man is nothing but in name, or, the body (building) is not guilty of

sinning, but the Good and Evil are working, and thru the destructive principles of Evil termed sin is Good or God Known, in, that the blind could not manifest the Truth, since, if, "the blind lead the blind, both shall fall in the ditch." Look at the innocent child who suffers, showing no fault of the child, nor the opinion that God caused it to suffer for what its parents did, tho it was thru what the parents did thru Evil which caused the child to suffer, and shows THE WORK OF EVIL.

Jesus said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but not my words," and why not? because "my words they are spirit and they are life." In other words, our idea of "Heaven shall pass away," for, there would be no reason to the argument if the earth and even heaven would pass away, since there is no space in which it could fill, because all space is and has forever been filled in some form or other, therefore it had no "BEGINNING" as referred to in the Old Testament. But the Truth—Words shall live "forever," showing again that heaven and hell does not exist as another locality, besides, there would not be much pleasure in going to heaven if it shall "PASS AWAY." It reads elsewhere: "With flesh I serve the law of Sin," or, "If ye live after the flesh ye shall die," which, of course, is true also, but IMPOSSIBLE to do otherwise so long as such a condition exists in abetting the Spiritual Idea as it says, "If ye root up the evil ye will root up the good also." I agree that "God is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever," that is the Principle of Working is the same. The Principle of Light is the same, but, like the Perfect Light it requires Time in which to

develop into the more Perfect way of Light and Life. So I say again, that man could not evolve into a more Perfect State above the brute or animal until Thought developed into a State of Consciousness, since there could have been no Soul-Sense of anything Higher, for, as in animal, it was like in man—Chaos and Darkness. From the very fact that man "must be born again," it is reasonable to hold the opinion there must be a FIRST BIRTH, which is due to the Natural Law of Evolution, which is "THE BEGINNING" of the SECOND BIRTH. The Old Testament illustrates the ignorance of life, and Nicodemus could not understand how man "must be born again" because he looked to a natural impossibility instead of a mental possibility as Paul says, "Be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds."

Emerson wisely wrote, "If John was perfect, why are you and I alive?" It seems impossible to define a thing unless there be a form of opposition, so the terms God and Satan are used, and you or man in the form of animal existence is referred to in Revelation as the "third part." Not that man in general, or that the individual—you—is at present to be made in glory, only that we are glorified in health according to our demonstration over the material conditions, but that "the promise" referred to by Paul is made a period, "When ALL mortality shall have put on immortality." Mortality lessens in itself to be used as an acquisition in life as material, just as to-day we have less use for material—wire—as is illustrated in "wireless telegraphy." It says: "they without us could not be made perfect." "They," refers to a

coming or future generation, for, if YOU were to become perfect LATER, there would be no Reason —Sense—Soul to the above passage. The first settler in a foreign land clears the same of its forests, that a city may be planted, and a more advanced state of civilization reached, which benefits him in "PART" or SOME degree, Just as man has "part in the resurrection:" Some Knowledge as to the future life of man. It may seem HARD, or "A CROSS," yet, we as bodies must "BEAR IT" as Jesus did more than any man of his time because he had a knowledge of it, and therefore could be the only man to bear it, and even under ridicule as all FIRST Knowledge is ridiculed. Man as Satan, makes it "A CROSS" for the Man as God.

> Nay but, O man, who art
> Thou that repliest against God?
> Shall the thing formed say
> To him that formed it, Why
> Hast thou made me thus?

It might be well to mention here that the above remark made by Paul is confined to Thought, rather than Creation, tho it APPEARS to refer to creating the material man because it says: "formed it." Man is no exception to the animal in Creation, but, because of a Conscience, he expresses himself sometimes in complaint of nature, and not necessarily because of complaint against God. The above verse illustrates the natural tendency to complain, and the absurdity of such complaint, when we are existing only thru a law that governs all things. Man is called "the image"

because Thought gave it as the Highest form of Creation. If the Thought had developed to its full height at the time when the monkey developed, then, the monkey would have been "the image," or, the highest form of creation, and the man would never have existed, since, the Thought of such would have made it such, because the Thought would have developed a State of Consciousness in the monkey and ended there. While each formation or creation of living and moving things are PERFECT IN FORM as to THEIR KIND, it did not show the greater development of Thought until man was evolved. This you will note places God or Thought as not Wholly Perfect, because a Lower or Evil Thought could here be derived from the animal nature. You will find only in one instance where Jesus speaks about God as a Creator, and then it has all to do with Thought and not the things created. This is in Mark 13: 19. "For in those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the Creation which God created unto this time, neither shall be." Creation signifies THE END of that which is created, when referring to things created, while "creation which God created unto this time," is the Evolution of Thought working "UNTO THIS TIME," since all things were created long before the time in which Jesus lived, and so could not refer to material things "UNTO THIS TIME" —his time, and so the Thought working from generation to generation, or from "the beginning" of the end of creation. "Affliction" here, is the transformation the Evil is going thru by its abolition being made by the Higher Sense of Life. In

other words, as it says in Revelation: "The devil knoweth that he hath but a short time to live." In John it speaks of "all things were made by him," but this was the opinion and the words of John, and were so to John because he believed it, just as Paul and others have believed and said "God created all things." Jesus did not say God created all things," but "there is only one Good and that is God," therefore, God could not create "all things" else God would be the Author of Evil, or that which is opposed to Good—God, which is impossible, since, "ye cannot gather grapes from thorns."

All forms and the primitive state of man are alike, or they did and could exist without what I term God and Satan, since Thoughts are a separate existence when concerning Good and Evil things. Because certain laws exist, and man frames the laws accordingly, you will say, "how can what you claim is the law be made unless God created things in nature." I say man makes law because of certain existing conditions that are derived from the conditions that exist, and not that man—the individual living, necessarily makes them. He speaks of them as made by him, because they are expressed in this way, but, they would naturally be so and so, yet, they are again changed and seem to be changed by him when that condition cannot exist because of other conditions which come up more reasonable as a natural sequence or following, which is due to Evolution, and not due to the individual direct. To ask "what causes Evolution" is to be ignorant of the fact that no law can remain in existence for a long

period which conforms to degeneracy, or is opposed to growth. You say "God Caused it to rain," but Science teaches us this is not true.

"Whatever lowers the temperature of the air at any place below the dew point, is the CAUSE of rain. Ascending currents are caused by the heating of the earth's surface, for then the superincumbent air is also heated and consequently ascends by *its levity*. Air-currents are forced up into the higher parts of the atmosphere by colder, drier and therefore heavier wind-currents getting beneath them, and thus wedgeways thrusting them upwards; and the *same result* is accomplished by ranges of mountains opposing their masses to the onward horizontal course of the winds, so that the air, being forced up their slopes, is cooled, and its vapor liberated in showers of *rain* or *snow*. Again, the temperature of the air is lowered, and the *amount* of the *rainfall* is increased, by those winds which convey the air to higher latitudes."

I have given *italics* to the words in the quotation in order to impress the reader with the facts as to what is the CAUSE AND EFFECT, and WHY the "amount of the rainfall is increased," showing that God is not the Cause, and does not INCREASE nor DECREASE the rain when that class of persons appeal to an "Unknown God" by prayer to make a change. It is the same "Unknown God whom Therefore ye ignorantly worship, him I declare unto you" (Acts 17: 23). It is impossible for the Mind to conceive the fundamental idea of how things are formed in the Natural form of Creation, because the Thought cannot conceive anything which it had no real

part in forming. If the Mind or Thought was the Creator of organic life, it would be a matter of fact that it could unfold the idea of how it created things, just as the buildings, etc., are the result of thought and development by expression, and after their creation the thought expresses the idea of how they were created by what is expressed in the things created, or, man is able to unfold the idea of how the building is created.

Here we may turn from the present subject to that which also deals with Evolution in that it points facts as given by Spencer, that Language did not originate at any time prior to nature, which should lead one to believe that God could not exist prior to nature, but, like Language is a growth correlative with nature. Spencer says, "Up to quite recent days, Language was held to be of supernatural origin. That this elaborate apparatus of symbols, so marvelously adapted for the conveyance of Thought from one mind to another mind, was a miraculous gift, seemed unquestionable. No possible alternative way could be thought of by which there had come into existence these multitudinous assemblages of words of various orders, genera, and species, moulded into fitness for articulating with one another, and capable of being united from moment to moment into ever-new combinations, that represent with precision each idea as it arises. The supposition that, in the slow progress of things, Language grew out of the continuous use of signs,—at first mainly mimetic, afterward partly mimetic, partly vocal, and at length almost wholly vocal—was an hypothesis never even conceived by man in early stages of

civilization,—and when the hypothesis was, at length, conceived, it was thought too monstrous an absurdity to be even entertained. Yet, this monstrous absurdity proves to be true. Already, the evolution of Language has been traced back far enough to show that all its particular words, and all its leading traits of structure, have had a natural genesis, has been natural from the beginning. Not only has it been natural from the beginning, but it has been spontaneous. Going on without any authority or appointed regulation, this natural process went on without any man observing that it was going on. Solely under pressure of the need for communicating their ideas and feelings—solely in pursuit of their personal interests—men little by little developed speech in absolute unconsciousness that they were doing anything more than pursuing their personal interests. Take the whole population of the globe, and there is probably not one in a million who knows that in his daily talk he is carrying on the process by which Language has been evolved."

I repeat that the Mind or Thought really developed thru Creation, or, that it could not develop without the natural, any more than man could express the idea of a building without the aid of materials used. It is also to our sense and thought that things look beautiful to us, since, to the animal none of these things can appear unusual as to beauty. It is only because the Conscience has developed a state of thought, that we can express things as beautiful, just as Adam gave the names to things so spoken heretofore; therefore, we should not WONDER AT THE BEAUTY OF THINGS,

for we are admiring only what we have developed to admire, just as we have developed to loathe some things, or "there is no good or bad in anything, but thinking makes it so."

The aforesaid remark made by Paul is only A HINT, and illustrates those who claim to know so much about creation and yet complain by saying: "Why did God make us So," or "if there is no other world and life for us hereafter why all this work and turmoil," or "why is it so and so," or "what are we created for," and all such silly rot, as tho it could be otherwise than what they are, when certain conditions exist which make it so, It is not for me to say why am I thus, because IT IS SO, OR, THUSLY, and "I am" as "I am," and will be what I will, because whatsoever the Conscious Thought IS, that IS the life "I am." It would be just as reasonable to ask "why is there a world?" It is not that the acorn can say to development, "Why hast thou made me thus," since it has no voice in the matter of Natural Evolution, any more than man has any individual voice in the Spiritual Law of Evolution. I use the term "this life," or "this world" because there is no other way in which to give an idea of two distinct ideas existing as one condition of life. So, this space will be changed from THIS WORLD to the OTHER WORLD when the Natural Law and condition is abolished—replaced by the Spiritual Law as Wholly existing here, instead of the two present Laws existing, and not the general opinion that the world is to be destroyed, for, in the words of Jesus, "I came not to destroy, but to save the world." Jesus spoke of the body—

building—when he said "I can of myself do nothing."

It is reasonable to believe that in Time, thought in all forms of life will be capable of greater possibilities than we of to-day are able to enjoy. Perhaps there is no more evidence of this than in "Wireless Telegraphy." I predict the time is coming when there shall be no use for the Postal Service as far as correspondence is concerned. The proof of this is already discernible by Telepathy, or transmission of thought from one person to another. The proof that thought is transferred from one person to another in a crude way, or not in a distinct way and apprehension of a thing, is shown in the remark: "talk of the devil and he is sure to appear," because, the person making this remark has received a slight telepathy of the coming of such a person. If you are able to talk with a person by the wireless telephone, then, the only reason preventing one person talking with another at a distance, is because the law of attraction in this form has not developed, or we might use the term—discovered, yet, the word developed is only proper in the meaning that nothing exists in such form until it has developed. I understand "the secret of wireless telegraphy lies in the instrument that attracts." Why not then, believe that the secret which is a secret only because the idea has not developed, is the method that shall attract one person to another, and like in many other things shall take the place of material—wire—or postal means of carrying. I do not believe as some contend, that "thoughts go about in the air, landing here or there," or where no Conscience

shall be receptive to them, since, no Power or Thought can be given to a person, and over another, unless the one person is willing to be influenced by another. I would be hell, and a fool, if I were in a position to receive such, or allow other persons to send me Evil Thoughts. How absurd,—to think if some person held to the Thought that I am bad, or sent me such Thoughts, —I would be bad—making me subject to what other people Thought. I am subject only to my own Thoughts, and by being Conscious of the Thought and Power, I have Thought and Power to overcome the influences which may surround me, in the proportion that the condition is Thought. In order to illustrate that "I am" God and Satan —Good and Evil Thoughts, I repeat "ye are not of this world, even as I am not of the world, I and my Father are one." This is significant of you —man or Jesus as God. Then he said, "Ye are of your father, the devil, and the lust of your father, ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the Truth, because there is no Truth in him." This is significant of you—man or Jesus as Satan or the Unity of Evil in individual form of expression. Note here also, that Satan—"Father"—is in "the beginning," just as God—"Father"—is in "the beginning," and the same weight is here thrown upon the Father who is the Spirit of Good, as upon the Father who is the Spirit of Evil—the word Father in the quotation referring to God being written with a capital F, because the Truth is greater than the error. If these two remarks did not refer to you or man as the Expression of Thought,

or as leading two lives in one, then they would be contradictory, as are all Bible quotations if you take them figuratively. Of course, I can understand where some who read these passages will say,—"these remarks were not delivered to the same persons, or at the same time and place, and therefore, must refer to different persons." You will always note in the religious life and view, a certain class condemning another or saying, "I am glad I am not as other men," and so they infer that the Evil remark could not allude to them, but to the other class. But Jesus did not necessarily refer to the people as one class being good and another class being evil, only in the meaning that he was illustrating THE TWO CLASSES at DIFFERENT TIMES—so the two remarks at different times. These I repeat pertain to Thought, because they are as it says "in the beginning," while you—"Ye" as being addressed here, were in the present, and only existing to-day as a body, but to-morrow as "John," because you were not in "the beginning," yet, existing as the Thought by MAN-ifestation, just as the good and bad construction of a building is the expression of a good and bad idea of construction as long as THE BUILDING STANDS. We will close this chapter by again saying, the only God there is, is Man, and the only Satan there is, is Man; but the time is coming when there shall be but one Law and One Life which is God—Man (man is plural here). To-day Man leads a DUAL LIFE, and all men have not been able to think the same, and then when all think the same, it is but the beginning of the end of the Natural condition, as it says in Revelation,—

"but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." Jesus said "ye cannot serve two masters," which illustrates that all should hold the same view and one Thought, tho the general religious view and the idea of most persons of any view is that it is impossible for all to have the same view, and so we have many Religions, yet we are told in the following PLAIN WORDS,—

"Now I beseech you, brethren,
By the name of our Lord Jesus
Christ, that ye all speak THE
SAME THING, and that there
Be no diversions among you,—
But THAT ye be perfectly joined
Together in the SAME MIND,
And the SAME JUDGMENT,
As that of our Lord Jesus Christ."

THE SOUL IS SENSE.

"Jesus said unto them, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy Soul, and with all thy mind."

There has so much been said about "the Soul of man," that it seems almost impossible to raise with profit any voice above the many different views, yet, most of the opinions expressed by those who are supposed to be reliable and able thinkers, seem to end the same, or that there is an individual soul of man which exists after death. It is like the idea of most religionists who are preaching a different view of the future state of man, yet believing they will all terminate into the same heaven. This to me is very much in error, tho it may seem pleasing because it relieves one of a certain responsibility in finding the true way, since, it is so much easier to go by DIFFERENT channels or roads, because it offers an excuse for not finding and knowing the ONE way. We must come into the realization that there is but ONE ROAD which leads to the Truth in anything, as Jesus illustrates in the remark,—"He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up SOME OTHER WAY, the same is a thief and a robber." Like in my former remarks of the True God or Thought as living forever, so I will agree that the True Soul of man exists forever, but not in the same meaning as given by some Psychologists, who have aimed to reveal to

us the True Soul. So I have defined the word Soul as that of the word Sense and will verify the facts by aiming to explain the same. That the Soul is nothing more than the Sense of things, or the Sense of a thing, and exists forever in meaning that any Truth exists forever, is shown in the above quotation, while the Soul or Sense of things Natural can only be temporary as its name signifies. What reason would there be in saying man should "love the Lord with all thy Soul," if it pertained to the individual as having a Soul existing as an individual? The word "thy," here signifies you, or an individual, and the word Soul signifies Sense because of the word "all" thy in connection with the word Soul, since, "All" thy Sense should be used in the aim to destroy *all* thy Sense of the lower idea of life; therefore "all," removes the individual meaning of any single word or Soul, because it is not singular in meaning. Therefore, "thy soul" is thy Sense of life, and one should use "all" his Sense of life as to what constitutes the Higher Idea in order to reach the Idea. This Sense is also indivisible, but used in connection with the word "thy" in order to give the individuality of the meaning of the Unity of the Soul. To "love the Lord with ALL thy Soul" or Sense of a Higher Life, which Higher is Heaven because it is above the Lower or Earth Sense of life, will in Time, or at the end of Time, be the whole Soul and bodily form of life. The Spiritual Sense and Thought then, is the Soul of a thing which exists forever. Like all things, we are coming into a different view, or should view the word Soul as the meaning of a thing, and when that meaning

is thoroly and properly used, it will develop such as the meaning signifies. And what is this different Sense, but a different Soul? Not that the Soul changes in its Truth of Being, but that the Idea or Truth of Soul changes in man as his Idea of Spiritual Life changes. The eternity of the Soul is but the existing qualities that live forever, and these are the only Souls which exist forever. There can be no individual Soul, because it is like as Eternal Thought or God, and the True Souls are the Unity of Spirit, yet, the Soul or Sense of a thing appears individual to man because used by individuals. There can be no such thing as a "Soul of man," other than that it exists for the use of man to be a quality thru which he is to make the most of life.

Spencer in quoting Cieza says, "Soul they called *Sonccon*, a word which also means heart," also Crantz tells us the Greenlanders believe in two souls—viz., the shadow and the breath." It remains only to note the progressive differentiation of the conception of the body and soul, which the facts show us, as in the last chapter we saw that, along with the growth of intelligence, the idea of that permanent insensibility we call death, is gradually differentiated from the idea of those temporary insensibilities which simulate it till at length it is marked off as radically unlike; so, here, we see that the ideas of a substantial self and an unsubstantial self, acquire this strong contrast by degrees; and that increasing knowledge, joined with a critical growing faculty determine the change." Emerson says: "Life will be imaged, but cannot be divided or doubled. Any

invasion of its unity would be chaos. The Soul is not twin-born, but the only begotten, and tho revealing itself as child in time, child in appearance, is of a fatal and universal power, admitting of no co-life."

To claim God or Thought is Eternal is to claim Soul is Eternal, but when you claim there is a Soul of man, you take away the Eternity and Unity of the Soul, or make an individual of the Soul. Jesus said: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the Soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Tho men are able to destroy the body as in war, yet they are not able by such means to destroy the Sense or Soul, or Senses or Souls which the man embodies, since they are qualities that can only be destroyed by Thought. The first part of the verse alludes to what I have just said—as in war, are those "which kill the body," and concerns the individual directly, while the latter part of the verse refers to the Soul or Sense that is embodied by the form or individual, or, "fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell," "Which" is Satan, or the Natural or Sense of error "which" rightly destroys the body thru disease, and the result is "both soul and body in hell." The man's Soul or Sense is lost with the body—that is, the body is certainly of no use to that man when his Sense of Reason is lost, and THEN IS, "both soul and body in hell." So then, the ONE, or "him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell," is Satan—the sinful Thought, and not as generally "believed" a God at one time lovely, and at another

time filled with hatred. The Sense of error which is Evil Thought, is that which destroys the Sense of Truth which is Eternal, and THEN AND THERE THE BODY ALSO, for, such a condition IS HELL for that man, and not "will be hell hereafter" for that individual.

You cannot destroy the Truth, nor even the Error of a thing by destroying the body-building. The ignorant people had this experience with Jesus and others, and in fact, all growth of knowledge given by those who have made Science a study, have at one time or another fallen by the ax of those who were in power to wield it, but you will note the words of Truth live after the death or destruction of that body. The Christ Idea and Soul or Sense of a thing is never destroyed because you have destroyed the body. Man under the Sense and fire of Error, or Soul of Error is subject to diseased conditions, and therefore a fit subject for hell, because the condition of that body IS HELL. If your body is diseased, you can only lay the Cause in most and extreme cases to the Sense Of "HIM—Satan—"WHICH" is responsible for the disease, since the body can "TAKE NO THOUGHT OF ITSELF," therefore only subject to the Soul or Sense of Thought it embodies. Spenser says, "For of the Soul, the body form doth take, For Soul is form and doth the body make." It stands to reason in my estimation that only in the form of Soul as Sense could the condition of the body be changed—formed, not as to "shape"—form of the body, but the conditions of that body. It being the Spiritual Sense or Soul that lives forever, such a Sense of Life Thought

will bring about the Spiritual form of man. Jesus said "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give rest to your souls." This signifies the Senses or Souls of those present, and those who follow in the same belief, because their past Sense of life has been and is a detriment to a Higher idea of life in living after the Senses of the Natural life. And tho referred to individuals as "ye," it does not infer that the word Souls referred to the individual, yet, "your souls" can be referred to as having these Senses or Souls of life, and not necessarily lose its indivisibility as the Unity of One Sense of Life. In this Sense the Soul is Eternal, which, of course, is the Soul FOR MAN, and for ALL MEN, but not "OF" man. The time was when there was no sense or soul of anything, but, each generation unfolds by development, a much more faculty. It would be just as well to abandon this word "Soul" for that of Truth, if we could realize the Truth thru any other channel than the Sense, but, as the Sense of Truth can only be realized by what is termed the Senses, or the Sense of a thing, we can conclude the Soul inevitable. You will perhaps say, "Why not use the word Sense then instead of the word Soul, if the word Soul is a synonym to Sense." The word Sense can be applied in many and more proper ways of usage than the word Soul, just as the word Spirit is used in a sentence to express the same meaning as the word God, yet, Spirit refers to the word Satan also. The word Soul is separate from the word Sense when the word Sense is applied to individuals, from the very fact that one man is not directly responsible for the Sense which another

man holds of a thing; therefore, Sense can be used instead of Soul because of the actual Truth of the indivisibility of the Soul. To my thinking, Soul is a synonym to Truth and man when it is applicable to Truth and man, but when it applies to Error, it is synonymous to Error, from the very fact that there are different Senses of Truth and Error. So I say again, that some Psychologists write concerning the immortality of the Soul as that which is the Soul of each or individual man that lives forever. They "believe" and so write and preach from mere belief only, thereby making "THE WORDS OF GOD OF NONE EFFECT" HERE. One, Prof. Barnes who is very much of a "believer" said, "thinkers are a detriment to the people generally." This is the substance of one of his lectures I listened to recently, and Saying also, that "I expect to be up there looking down on the people." In an article recently, and because Henri Bergson said "the brain is merely the physical instrument of transmission of thought from the intangible mind, or Soul, to the physical body," that "it must be admitted that the continuity and evolution of individuality accompanied by all the usual manifestations of the thinking being, even to intelligible conversation, is possible and even probable after the disintegration of the material body." We could agree that "the brain is merely the physical instrument of transmission of thought," and having admitted this, you must also admit that the thought cannot exist without the physical, or as he says below; "the complete independence of thought and matter." He says "the only reason man has to doubt of the life

hereafter is the visible, our bodies. And the object of the death of the material body. This reason vanishes immediately the individual realizes the complete independence of thought and matter." But how easy they who claim "the individual soul lives on," always in some way "side track" their "knowing" by having a little "doubt" on their view as probably incorrect because "the visible our bodies, and the object of the death of the material body." The "object of the death of the material body" is simply under a Natural Law of Life and Death, or a growth and decay, or the Law of Natural Evolution in that you plant seed it will grow, and you harvest, and replant that it will grow, which is the "REASON" for "THE VISIBLE OUR BODIES." If Psychologists will only give in to the views of Physiologists, and *vice versa* or as both being instruments to the two Laws Working—Spiritual and Natural—until one or the other is abolished thru the work of the other, there would be more harmony along religious lines. In other words, to again use the phrase of Spencer: "We can only speak of matter in terms of Mind, and we can only speak of Mind in terms of matter." When we speak of a separation, we lose the significance of the meaning that the Christ as the Idea is the Soul or Sense of Life that should be lived here as Jesus taught and lived to the best of his ability, and it cannot be lived here, if it be taught that such, or the Spiritual Life shall be lived in another world, or that we should prepare ourselves to live it in another world, other than that it is separate from the physical because of its Spiritual meaning. The idea too, that the Soul or Spirit

"leaves the body," is absurd, and when they tell you this, they too are "seeing things" from mere "belief." We should not claim any real separation in a way, but know that the body is that Spirit or Soul Expression so long as this or that body exists, just as the Thought is manifested by the body. We know the Soul and the Thought as the body is known. We see the Soul and Thought of man by the action-body of that man. If you could see and "believe" the Spirit or Soul leaves the body, then you could observe and believe the Truth leaves the body. It would be absurd to "believe" you could make a diagnosis of Truth, other than it is expressed by what exists in Truth. Man is just as much of Truth as he Expresses, and Truth is just as much of man as it is expressed. Because man embodies Spirit, and a Sense of Truth and Error, it is not to be construed into a fact that they are IN THE BODY, but are THAT BODY MEANINGLY. You may easily form the opinion, or believe that Spirit leaves the body, if you could hold the idea that it was, or is in the body. I claim all there is to Spirit is what is Expressed, and all there is to Soul is the Sense of a thing expressed, and all there is to man is what he expresses in the visible, because there is no such thing as that which is invisible. You take a piece of paper and drop it where the wind is, and it will move and sway according to the wind, and thereby expresses the movement of the wind, (Spirit) but, the WIND IS NOT IN IT—THE PAPER, (body). Yet it embodies the wind because of its movement. If the wind were in it, then would the wind be subject to control by

it, and thereby would seem individual, just as man seems individual because he expresses life as an individual. Neither is the paper IN the wind (Man cannot be IN Spirit) but it becomes A PART of the wind, or we may say, is the wind in itself, and like man, is the individual expression of the Soul-Spirit, and is that Spirit in itself. When the paper becomes absorbed (burned or decayed) or not a part of the wind by expression of movement, it is just the same as man who is not able after death (decayed) to express the Spirit, the Soul, the Thought or God of Life, yet, the Spirit, etc., is seen by other bodies by Expression, just as the wind continues to move and is seen by other material bodies.

Jesus said "the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but cannot tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." In other words, no man can define Thought or Spirit, other than what is Expressed in life, just as the wind is not definable only as it is seen by its direction, and cannot especially go anywhere, nor come from any place, therefore, it neither cometh nor goeth, but IS. So IS every man that is born of the Spirit—the same action as that Spirit by body manifestation. While Soul, Sense, Spirit, etc., are not defined the same as solids, they are no less components. In speaking of the Natural, Jesus said, "No man can see God at any time and live." That is, no Natural Soul or Sense of a thing can stand before the test of the Spiritual Soul or Sense of Life and live,—man being used as the form of either Sense Working. If the above referred to

man individually and specifically, or figuratively, it would contradict the saying: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." The "pure in heart" cannot avoid seeing God, because God is seen only as the pure in heart is manifested.

It is recorded in the Bible that Jesus said to the "Doubtful Thomas," "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." Jesus was not living, tho we find "he said" these words. I might mention here the fact that mesmerism, tho not known as such in those days, played a very prominent part in the life of Jesus and latter days of the disciples. The above remark seemed to come from Jesus because of a SELF mesmeric state. This illustrates their OWN THINKING—of the eleven disciples—directed to one—Thomas who could not see as they believed. It was a kind of ventriloqual expression of their thought coming from the vision of Jesus, and it certainly was a "Vision," since he—Jesus could no more exist after the Natural death, than any other of his time, or the present time. This was a very good "doctrine" in those days, or any "adulterous generation SEEKING A SIGN," or looking to the future. I think we are advanced to-day because we have more men like the "doubtful" Thomas. He was the ONLY MAN OUT OF TWELVE, who did not believe in visions, or insane ideas, and so, had no fear of expressing his feelings when he did not understand a thing, and this is all that this verse illustrates in reality, tho some biased mind may "believe" Jesus said these things. Because of the eleven holding to the one view, may have induced Thomas to yield

to their idea so as to show no discord among them, and thereby strengthen the teaching. The other disciples had heretofore shown their ignorance and cowardice from the very fact that Jesus HAD PREVIOUSLY "REBUKED THEM MANY TIMES for their LACK OF UNDERSTANDING." They dare not "ask any more questions," so they merely "believed." This verse illustrates how true in life it is, or how ignorant people would remain if there were no Thomases to ask questions when in doubt. The Professor talks on a subject before a class of students and afterwards questions them as to their understanding of the subject. They exclaim "we Know," ("believe"), but they do not rise to explain why they know, yet, one who is not afraid to admit his ignorance, arises from among them saying, "I do not understand." The Professor proves by showing thru a demonstration of the subject, instead of by words or parable only, and thru this one—Thomas, are all in the class made wise to it. I will agree that Jesus appeared to the disciples in a VISIONARY WAY, and that "the resurrection" but signified the then visionary idea of the Truth. This visionary sight was due to the constant thought of seeing Jesus, for, if it were true that Jesus appeared, we might well say the ground taken by Spiritualists is a fact regarding "Spirit manifestation," etc. But as Jesus "CHOSE" his disciples, and as all who accept such are of the same temperament, we can conclude they were and are easily brought under such a state of seeing, which, of course, was and is a good thing for them and all who live under the age of superstition and view of the future,

for, "where ignorance is bliss 'tis folly to be wise."

In Luke 12: 19-20 we read,—"And I will say to my soul, soul thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink and be merry. "But God said, unto him, Thou fool! this night thy soul shall be required of thee; then whose shall those things be, which thou hast provided?" Here we have in the first quotation, the illustration of Conscious self. "I will say to my Soul"—man Conscious of an Evil Sense, or a selfish Evil claiming its own. In the next verse we have the illustration of Man being Conscious of the opposite, since, we find the Higher Thought replacing the Lower Thought by the expression—"thou fool" when the Higher appeared. How truly this illustrates the Natural Sense or Soul of man as he thinks only of self, and like all thought of a future pleasure and heaven as a locality, he is, at any time, liable to leave behind him the opportunity to live and enjoy life as he travels. We hear people say as the above illustrates,—"I will work hard and accumulate for so many years, and then take my ease." They little realize the overburden they are heaping upon themselves, for, the result is sometimes felt, because the overwork and too much thought for the future has crowded TOO MANY DAYS INTO ONE DAY. Then too, "thou fool," this night might be your last, and "those things" which you have stored away will not benefit you. We spend too much time and "worry over our children," as tho they, and even those who are related otherwise, have no chance as we have had in the world to make a living. We are a detriment, when we do not allow

the same talent to work in those following as it works in us. This is the Natural Sense or Soul of Reason taken from the child that should develop in it.

If, according to Spenser, "The Soul is form and doth the body make," it is my understanding that the Natural Soul or Sense of Life is the body manifestation of this Life, and unavoidable because of the present and former Natural Condition, and to remove the same as Cause, in a way, we should in order to bring about the Spiritual body manifestation only, use the Spiritual Soul or Sense of Life as Cause, which, of course, can only be accomplished thru the Thought Sense thereof, as Jesus says, "with ALL thy Soul, and with all thy mind"—Thought. Paul speaks of this, or I define it as such, when he said,—"The first man Adam was a living Soul; the last Adam WAS made a quickening Spirit. "Howbeit that was not first which is Spiritual, but that which is Natural; and afterward that which is Spiritual." The TWO Adams represent Matter and Spirit—"the first man Adam" was Adam after the flesh, which had a different "Soul" or Sense of Life and lived accordingly. "The last Adam"—called Jesus, and Adam because of the flesh relation—represents the Spirit or Mental, and living more accordingly. Note how the word "IS" is used by Paul. He does not say nor claim that God, or the Spiritual WAS Spiritual or FIRST, because if God was the origin or Creator, it should read, howbeit, that IS not first which WAS Spiritual, but it says, Howbeit, that WAS NOT FIRST which IS Spiritual. The word "is," following the

word "was," is significant that the Spiritual "WAS NOT FIRST."

In Revelation 16: 3, it reads, "And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as the blood of a dead man: and every living soul died in the sea." In this verse we give the definition of Angel as that of Thought, and "the sea" as that of man or "nations." "Blood" signifies essential life, and "Soul" signifies Sense. The Truth which the "vial" or vessel of understanding contained, is given—"poured upon the sea"—to the people, and became as the blood—life—of a dead man," because it—the Truth appeared as "dead" to man, but now received as the "blood"—life of man, and therefore caused the destruction of the Natural Senses, or Souls of life, for, "every living soul" or Sense of things died in the sea—minds of the people. If you still hold to the idea that you have an individual Soul to lose or to retain; it should be silenced here, because "EVERY" living soul died," which illustrates no chance for any living being or soul to live. But it is "every living" Sense of a material nature shall be abolished or "die" or be destroyed when it shall have run its course which shall be at the end of Time when the Spiritual Sense shall be Absolute.

Emerson says: "Because the Soul is progressive, it never quite repeats itself, but in every act attempts the production of a new and fairer whole." Now, if the Soul or Sense of a thing was settled, or did not advance as Time and Thought advanced —developed, we might "believe" or even think each individual man has a Soul. But, my Soul

to-day (not mine either), is not the Soul or Sense of to-morrow, only in the degree that it Reasons and lives the same to-morrow. Now, if the average man or individual had the work to do, we could not conceive of such Perfection, because man generally views from things that appear material and in form as it is to-day, rather than accept the Universal Thought development. He believes because he sees man to-day in one light, that he should always remain so here, but change hereafter, when really there is no other place for him to work, since, "God is not the God—" Work "of the dead, but of the living." Job said, "My Soul chooseth death," because the Evil or flesh he had lived after worked in him to such an extent that he suffered disease of the flesh, and so preferred death, for, the Material Sense or Soul could only release itself from suffering by death, since there could be no suffering in that body after the Sense of life became extinct in such a bodily form. We can now see or should see by experience and observation ("Judge by the signs of the times") that such forms of life in disease are not the true forms of Spiritual life. The asylums and such like are but the land-marks to a thing that should not stand. It is time we should not care to experience these things ourselves, in order to prove them, but should learn thru the experience of others that HERE and NOWHERE ELSE is Perfection reached, or, as Emerson says "here or nowhere is the fact." Persons will then say, "if I ever arrive at such a condition wherein I have lost my Soul—Sense of Reason, I trust I shall not be placed in such asylums, but be given some potion that

will end my days; for I shall be useless and an expense to the public, and care not to take the chance of regaining my Sense," which is the only Soul that can exist and can be lost, and which is lost to that man only as a bodily existence, the Good and Evil Souls—Senses live on until the Evil Sense is destroyed by the Good—God Sense.

Let us deal here with what are termed the different Senses used, and we shall find that the one Great Sense of Reason is the Sense referred to in the Bible of Revelation as that of the "Seventh Angel" or last Sense to be reached. Not but what we have had reason in a way for some time, just as we have had the Sense of this or that, but that they have not always been defined as such. We have believed there were but "five senses, namely,—Taste, Smell, Touch, Hearing and Sight," but these are not now considered complete, as there are now what may be termed "Sensations of Organic life" and called the "Sixth Sense." It includes the feeling of Hunger, Thirst, Suffocation, etc. So then, we have the Sense of Taste, the Sense of Smell, the Sense of Touch, the Sense of Hearing, the Sense of Sight, and the Sense of Thirst, which are the Six Senses, and are embodied or formed by man and also animals having brain and nerve. Such animals and the primitive state of man have these Senses and need have no Conscience and Thought in order to have these Senses. Man, after the Thought and Conscience developed, received the Sense of Right and Wrong, Good and Evil, God and Satan, therefore the Sense of Reasoning which I define as the Seventh Sense and the Soul, which can be termed the Thought of Good and Evil working.

Jesus said, "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own Soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his Soul?" In other words, What profit would it be for me to gain riches, and then lose my Soul or Sense of Reason, and live in some asylum? Neither can a man give all these riches which he has gained for his Soul, or the return of it, or "give in exchange," to regain the Sense he has lost, because this is something money cannot buy. Here again we note that by using the term "his own soul" refers to the Reason of that man, because he has lost his Sense by living "after the flesh"—over sexual indulgence, and the "abuse" of nature; therefore the only person to suffer by the loss of his Reason, and a fit subject for hell HERE, since, he is in a state of not being able to benefit himself or those with whom he comes in contact. Man must of himself be this Truth, for, by living the Truth, he retains the Soul or Sense of Reason he might have lost. Jesus said concerning this Truth, "For whosoever will save his life shall lose it,—and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it." That is, he that shall be Conscious of the Spiritual life, shall not be Conscious of the Natural life, or "lose HIS life," and he that shall be Conscious of the Natural life, shall not be Conscious of the Spiritual life, or "will save his life shall lose it." To be Conscious of God is to save the Soul to that extent by Reason saves the Soul of them thereafter, since, by propagation of a Good Sense are they who inherit by propagation subject to the things inherited, which is to say the more the Higher Sense or Soul is developed, just that

much more of God or Good Thought exists. Many a parent, if they have not seen their own Soul-Sense lost in themselves, have seen it lost in themselves by their offspring. Some of the offspring do not inherit so much of the Sensual, because the Sense of Evil is not so prominent in the parent Conscience at one time as another, nor is it the same always during pregnancy. The child inherits these evils if the mother has any desire of some evil during pregnancy,—also, this may be while the child is nursing. Neither does the whole fault lay with the mother for the hereditary and certain evil and diseased conditions of the child, since the seed of the father may be infected with the germ of evil and disease. One case I note in particular was a woman, who, while in "carrying" gave birth to two boys at two different states of feeling or desire, and both turned out in life—after maturity—to be just the type she had held in Conscience during pregnancy. She had proclaimed for one during pregnancy the love of lust and the other a fondness for books—she, having a liking for books and reading the same almost continually at the one time, while at the other time, she thought more of sexual desire. This is her statement, and I believe it, because it had been my observation with other cases of a like nature. A case comes to my mind now, of a woman demanding whiskey while she was in a pregnant state, to such an extent that the husband thought it best to give in and so procured the same and she indulged in it like one in great thirst for water, and the result was she became very sick. As soon as she regained her normal condition, she did not

care to drink any more, in fact it became sickening to her thought. The result was that after the child became of age, it could hardly bear even the sight of liquor. If the mother had not been satisfied with her liking and taking of the whiskey when she wanted it and then and there destroyed the appetite for it, the chances are the child would have "hankered" for it later in life. This is a case of hereditary, and we can give many proofs of its work, which, tho we find many who believe to the contrary because of their interpretation of certain passages in the Old Testament, or, as it says in Ezekiel, 18: 2, "What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge?" We can agree that if "the father" kills a person, that his child should not suffer for it, but, it will take on and suffer certain diseased conditions of the parent. So the Soul is under the same hereditary influence as any form of life. We read where Richard said, "My Soul and body on the action both," and we find many Richards after his making. This Soul is not the action of a Good Sense, but the action of an Evil Soul because it acts in the work of destruction. It also shows the "action" of the Evil Sense by the action of the "body," or "BOTH," or that the body acts with the Sense, or each IS AS THE OTHER, therefore, in the words of Spenser, "the soul is form and doth the body make." We speak of the Soul as immortal, and we speak of man as immortal, and I agree that they are immortal, because "they" in the form of Evolution exist, but not in the individual term as ap-

plying to YOU. When you say "Shakespeare is Immortal," I agree that Shakespeare, Plato, Socrates, Jesus and the like are Immortal, because their words of Truth live forever, or are Immortal, but not that Shakespeare, Plato, Socrates, Jesus and the like are Immortal. My parents are Immortal in so far as their words of Truth live, because their words live by me, but my parents are not Immortal. Let us remember then, only that which is Truth is Eternal, or that God as Thought is Eternal, and Immortal, and by so doing we shall be PARTAKERS, since, we have "PART IN THE RESURRECTION"— SOME KNOWLEDGE of building up a Soul and Body that is Eternal now in the Principle of Thought, but shall at the end of Time be embodied as such in the Visible, or as a Whole Soul which is Eternal, instead of the present dual life of the moral and immoral Soul or Sense of Life.

"He may live without books—what is knowledge but grieving?
He may live without hope—what is hope but deceiving?
He may live without love—what is passion but pining?
But where is the man that can live without dining?"

Meredith.

He that loseth passion, shall grow in Knowledge, since passion hath no time for Truth.

THE RESURRECTION IS KNOWLEDGE.

"I am the Resurrection and the Life."

It has been in the preceding chapters that we arrive at the idea that God and Satan are Thought, and that the Soul is Sense of Thought which will bring about the final results, with a Knowledge that it is so. That the Resurrection is nothing more than Knowledge, is found in the above quotation, since its name can only be associated with the word Knowledge instead of a belief that it refers to a person being resurrected hereafter, yet, that person on whom the Knowledge is given, shall be resurrected above that which is below, therefore, "the Resurrection." "I am the resurrection and the life." (i.e.) It is thru me (I am) that the Resurrection—Knowledge of a Higher Life shall be known. How absurd and void of meaning this remark would be, ("I am"), if you should apply it to the idea that Jesus was "resurrected from the dead" when he here was teaching what the meaning of the resurrection would do, and not that it applied to an after life, as is the general opinion put forth. Jesus made the above reply, when the same opinion was put to him about man living or being resurrected later in life. Martha said, "I know my brother shall rise in the last day." But Martha should, and all should know that then and there—here—this Knowledge—Resurrection should take place. This knowledge may be "grieving" to that person as it must have been to Jesus,

since, to a certain extent it is almost impossible to go against the inevitable and known existing conditions of a majority, because you are generally subject to like conditions, and because of the majority in ridicule.

Perhaps the most intricate of all passages and the one subject innermost in man is that which concerns the resurrection. The reason I suppose is the natural tendency to be always looking and thinking of the future. We give more time to seeking than doing, for, after we have sought and found we fail to act, but keep on seeking in a way, and always overlooking that which seems an ever present fact. It is not because we are unwilling to act, that our progress is always hindered, but for fear of going astray, or to find sometimes our expectations at the end much less satisfactory to us because anticipation is generally greater than realization. This to me is a proof and very illustrative of a Truth, that it is not wise to look and anticipate for the future, other than that which seems a reasonable present in the "hope" of gaining a better end. Like Meredith, I do not approve so much of the word "hope," to an end that may be impossible, and as it is generally used, but sometimes use it for the want of a better one in explanation. To hope for a thing will not bring it, because hoping for a thing cannot produce it. It is the WORKING FOR A THING which will produce it. "Hope is deceiving" because you may hope for something which is in direct contradiction to Progress and Reason, or what may not be beneficial to you nor those with whom you come in contact. So, if you work for, instead of hoping

for, you are more liable to receive a thing, yet, do not even work for a thing that may be unreasonable at the end, as you are now hoping and working for a life which does not concern you now and here. There are quite a few hoping for, and even working for a something they shall not receive in the end, which same is due to believing in the resurrection as pertaining to another life after this, but as they will not know the difference after death, and find some comfort in the same while living, let them "hope" and "believe" so long as they do not continue as of old, in forcing and drawing others in the same net. Hope is used like the words "Love" and "Knowledge"—very often misused—and tho the word Knowledge may be used correctly, it does not always bring happiness, as Meredith says—"it is grieving" to the person using and living it as he sees it is so. The ignorant person, like the animal, drifts along with circumstances, taking no thought of Progress and making none, and yet receiving at times, more happiness out of life than the average person with Knowledge. The majority of people go about their work each day, never dreaming of the Truth, while the Truth silently works its way to the surface when it becomes more recognized and cannot be lost to sight, or "hidden" as it has been heretofore. People with a Knowledge of better conditions which can be reached thru this Knowledge, suffer under the load of trying to convince others of a better life, and also of being held up to ridicule. Jesus and Paul suffered by having the Knowledge of the fact that the Spiritual life was and is to be lived here, and because they could not continue to live

the life that was and is more universally lived. To convince persons to live as he taught was the work of Truth, but it was impossible then, and is impossible to-day to live such, in a universal way or wholly. "Knowledge is grieving" until it becomes universal, because until then, like in every walk of life, the burden is borne by one or a few, as in the case of Jesus regarding his Knowledge—Resurrection of a Higher Life. It is the universally living, or alike, which produces the harmony in a community, whether it be right or whether wrong, or whether it be Good or whether it be Evil. Great men have suffered, and even been put to death—Jesus was of this type—because they spoke before their time—had Knowledge of so and so—yet, such Knowledge as they taught in their day is being more universally believed and lived to-day. Jesus knew it would be thousands of years before the Knowledge he had of life would be lived or even thought of, therefore, he prophesied the "second coming" as necessary in order that the TRUTH he taught then would be more definitely understood and believed so as to work out the problem of Being. "And it came to pass, as he spoke these things, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed IS the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked. "But he said, Yea, rather blessed ARE they that hear the word of God and keep it. "For, behold, the days are coming, in the which they shall say, Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bare, and the paps which never gave suck." While this refers to that period wherein the Natural conditions shall be at an end, or "the Christ"

life shall be reached, we can see a glimpse of the fact that we are now approaching the beginning of that period, or it is to come under "this generation," since, it seems that about every two thousand years, there have been wonderful changes in the life of man. "History repeats itself" in that today is the beginning of "plagues" because of the over sexual indulgence and "abuse" has placed man and woman in a condition where they should not marry, unless for companionship, because of the offspring that would be brought forth in the world only to suffer in being subject to the worst forms of disease. Perhaps, the "influenza" is one of the "plagues," and if our eyes were opened to the fact that this disease is only the RESULT, we would understand the CAUSE, and like many other diseases caused by less sinful thoughts, we would begin to educate ourselves how to avoid them, rather than continue to listen to "worn out doctrines," such as "the weather, food," etc., as the Cause. The Physician assists one by relief and apparently cure for the time being, but the disease, if one continues in the indulgence will return, tho they are cured because during treatment they lessen the indulgence which allows the body to build up.

If there had been a rigid examination of "our boys" before they went to war, we would have had a very small army in the field, and we should now listen to the voice of Truth, and understand why so many were subject to the "flu" and other diseases, and why there are so many "at home" who are subject to the plague and other diseases. The fact that some cases of the "flu" develop into in-

sanity, while many develop into partial insanity, is proof that the disease is one of many that can be traced as having its origin in what is termed evil, or the "abuse" of nature. We are forcing nature in our aim to satisfy the appetite for food in the form of flesh, etc. We are so taken up with our selfish life, that the germ of corruption is in the air, and it is no wonder we are subject to most anything. I can understand why, when I lived more after nature that I was a "hearty eater," and felt worse, while now I eat one-fourth as much and feel better. I know persons who believe so much in nature, or "this life," that are "gluttons," and many are of advanced age, so it cannot be said "they are young and growing" and need the food to assist their growth. But I do not claim all of these persons with large appetites are necessarily partakers of over sex indulgence, since, food will build up that part of the body which is governed by the organs of that body, and the organ favored will demand food to sustain it. It need only be mentioned here that the "abuse" of nature likewise has its effect on the dog and other animals. This is why some dogs "go mad," while others are irritable and "snarl and bite" tho the latter is more characteristic of their nature. But, are we ready to accept the Truth? I think, hardly. How truly Kipling wrote, "a man who tells the Truth can live on a dollar a day." In other words, a man who tells the truth would be compelled to live on a dollar a day, because he would not be employed, nor would he be listened to in this age of deception. It is claimed by the Physician that this or that disease is "catching." How did the

FIRST ONE "CATCH IT?" Granting that it is catching in one sense, is due to the fact that the body was in a condition to catch it, or anything "suggested" to the sinful and diseased mind. A healthy person could not catch anything, even if it were suggested to them, tho they will eventually succumb to the law of growth and decay.

About twenty-five or thirty years ago, some of the best Physicians and Surgeons with whom I had been under treatment, entertained "no hope" for me. One of the number suggested that I take up Christian Science treatment. He had a sister in the east who was a Christian Science Practitioner, and was successful in treating all forms of disease, and suggested that I consult one of that following. Like many others, I objected and was at that time very much opposed to such a form of treatment. However, as a "last resort" I consented and commenced taking treatment. I was relieved at once, and Why? because, I was told to eat anything I wished. Heretofore I was told not to "eat this or that." None of them agreeing on anything alike, or, one would say "do not eat meat, but you could eat this," while another would say "do not eat this, but you could eat a little meat." The result was I was living on "wind," when my body needed food. It was not long before I was able to resume work, under the "Science" treatment, besides, I have lost but several days since, on account of sickness in all these years, and now in my fifty-sixth year feel younger than I did at twenty. The teaching being practically taken from the Bible, I soon understood the meaning of "take no thought for your

life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink." Also, "eat what is set before you and ask no questions for conscience sake." Again, "know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey." While this latter remark refers more to what has been said in regard to man being subject to Good and Evil Thoughts, or "whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness" as given in the same sentence, it also alludes to the fact that man is subject to what he believes in regard to the way and what you eat, as well as a belief in anything will influence you accordingly, for, "as ye believe, so be it done unto you." Holding to the belief and thought that "cabbage" will hurt you, or, any other food, makes a man "SERVANT" to that belief. While I had many times "cursed the day" when my parents were married, I became reconciled by the following parable,—"Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him." In other words, there is no sin to be forgiven, nor condemned, only in the way that one is unfortunate to be the offspring of those who have lived under certain natural conditions to that extent they are diseased as a result of the same. They are ignorant of such laws and so marry irrespective of whether they are healthy or not, so the parents and offspring suffer accordingly, yet, if in due time they recognize the cause, and know by Man-ifesting the Higher Thought—God, the works of this Thought will be "manifest," and thereby destroy the Lower Thought—Satan to a certain extent. It has been my observation that there are thousands doing

the same as my parents, since there can be no law against it, neither should be, because one should be allowed to drift, and must drift along with their Conscience, yet, the people should be educated along these lines of thought. I know many mothers and fathers whose parents should not have been married, yet they talk to their offspring in the way of marrying some day, which, if they only knew the condition of their parents, and their own, they would oppose talking and upholding marriage in regard to themselves. While Christian Science has been a help to me, yet, I dropped the study some fifteen years ago, because I could not get the entire Knowledge of the words written in the Bible until I reached the view I now entertain. It varies somewhat from the fact that there is no God to look up to, nor separate from Man, nor outside of the belief that YOU are the "GOD OF THE LIVING," tho You are also the Satan of the dead while the Thought works along material lines. I was rather amused recently in reading an article on "Christian Science Psychosis," a term used by Doctor Williams "to designate a definite type of mental aberration." As far as the religious idea is concerned, Religion as a whole has in somewise or other, been, "of mental aberration." But the doctrine of healing is significant of the time of Jesus, and thru this healing was and is the Knowledge to be reached as to the Real Cause of disease. We find in general religion to-day as in the time of Jesus the same opposition, and those who profess to be the disciples of Jesus are opposed to Christian Science. Jesus said, "And, as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom is at hand.

"Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give." "But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, this fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of devils." "And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand: "And if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how then shall his kingdom stand? "And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges." This last remark is significant that it is thru the evil methods that we have been and are trying to cast out evil. However, we will grant that the Matter Physician is necessary under the general present conditions of belief, just as the sporting house and other evils are necessary under present beliefs which have much to do with conditions, and such will not be changed until man and woman shall be educated and live adversely to the present methods of life. Some Physicians admit that "medicine will not cure a disease," but soothes the nerves in the form of a sedative, until healing takes place in the form of building up the body thru nourishment required to build that which was weakened.

In Christian Science, the teaching of the power of Thought in its God-Thought form, will soothe the nerves until the body responds to the healing as given above. While the Doctor criticises this treatment, yet he admits of a case where the patient became "morally, physically and mentally" healed. To my idea one could not advance above

being morally, physically and mentally relieved, unless in monetary matters. Doctor Williams cites "four types of persons," and apparently admits there is some relief by saying "Persons with an incurable affliction who, having tried everything else without benefit, seize upon this last straw with entirely pardonable avidity, and frequently most comforting results." But, he gives the "fifth" group by illustrating a case where a woman had the "far away expression," which was "scarcely disguised at any time." "It is quite impossible to fix her attention completely in conversation, even when the topic is of utmost importance to her." Then he goes on to say some of the "four types are somewhat wabbly in mental equilibrium." Granting that this may be true with many followers of Christian Science, I wonder why he evades the truth as to most of those who adopt his method of treatment, and as I have observed likewise "wabbly in mental equilibrium," as well as having "the far away expression," which have been noticeable even in some Physicians, unless the subject was very important. If the believers of Christian Science, and the believers of Physical Science were perfect in mind and body, there need be no further advance toward Perfection. But the Physical Scientist is slowly ebbing away, since he is hard pressed in finding some way by which he can entirely eradicate disease. In fact he cannot lessen disease, because it is "up to" Mental Science in the form of a Thought in Mind to destroy what is the real cause of disease, and when this is accomplished, that will be the beginning of the end of disease.

With all precaution thru the function of rules laid down by Sanitary Laws, there still exists a growing tendency of increased diseased conditious. This alone should prevail with the average thinking public that while they should respect cleanliness for the sake of that which is pure and clean, there must exist a something far superior to that rule prescribed by Sanitary Law thru which disease shall lessen its course. It is a notorious fact that the Law of Evolution cannot forever be hindered in its progress by methods outgrown, as in all lines of thought to-day there is a tendency not to accept "old doctrines," and the present manner in dealing with disease and its cause as of old cannot be recognized as correlative to the Law of Evolution. Especially is this true with the Evolution of Thought as it deals with the moral and immoral directly, instead of the present way of treating the physical directly, or almost wholly as a Physical Science.

Contagion is the farce thru which immorality works to cover morality, since it opens no avenue to better conditions, and immorality does not wish to convict itself of the fact that it alone is the great fundamental cause of disease in general. No Law of contagion can effect the Law of morality, neither can a real moral person be the object of contagion, else all would become diseased when a case of small-pox existed. It is a poor rule that will not fit a fact at all times and places. That is, if one person "catches" a thing, there is no reason why, under such a Law laid down by contagion, all persons when exposed should not catch it. Permit me to say that vaccination has never been proved

to be the means of preventing a person from being seized with small-pox, while it has to the contrary been proved to bring about a diseased condition, tho not the First Cause. We preach of germs and what they produce, while we applaud the Physician who injects into our system a germ of disease called a "vaccine point." If the vaccine does not "work" the first time, we fail to understand we have a healthy body, and so inject another until the flesh is unable to ward off this diseased germ, and so the body that was in a healthy state, has taken on a partially diseased condition. It is because the body is in an unhealthy state that the "first" injection "worked" the first time, and in many cases results in disease of some kind.

It is related that a certain man was healed after he had lived under the Law of what is termed sin. He was not questioned as to his cleanliness, nor asked if he had been exposed to "the weather and contagion," neither was he told to be careful of what he ate after being healed, but was told to "go and sin no more, lest A WORSE THING come unto thee." You will note that the words "sin no more" signify that indulgence of the brute nature caused the disease just healed, and that to repeat this indulgence after being weakened by the indulgence already indulged, would necessarily produce a worse form of disease. We are likewise told, "not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, This defileth the man." In other words, an Evil Thought must eventually result in an act of Evil. When we learn that over indulgence either in what is termed "natural" and unnatural

acts, which are the foundation and fundamental principles upon which the body responds to act as their agent, focusing the result of such acts; we have reached the knowledge of cause and effect, or that like produces like. Then, instead of treating the result in the form of disease, we will treat the cause, which treatment will be to replace the Evil Thought with that of a Good Thought, tho it is almost impossible to treat on such a subject at present, because the public is not willing to abandon a so-called pleasure for the Truth, and so they still ask in the words of Pilate, "What is Truth?"

We claim now that tuberculosis is contagious. With more than twenty years of observation and experience, I have found no case of tuberculosis or a light touch of the same, but what could be traced to an over indulgence in either the natural or unnatural acts, either that the patient was the participant, or the offspring of parents who indulged to excess in the same. Because the parents are weakened under this load, so are the children as a rule weakened thereby, and so tuberculosis as well as other diseases are hereditary. If tuberculosis is contagious, why in all cases under observation has not the wife caught the disease? or the husband caught the disease? when they have been known to live four or five years with the disease in its worst form—living in the same room, sleeping together, yet, the other remained sound and healthy?

Paralysis is even more noticeable as a result of this way of living. Is it any wonder then that we have "infant paralysis?" It is amusing to hear elders trying to convert their children, when the

parent mind is the first to be considered, since no law of growth will permit the idea that the younger shall exist prior to the older. Remember, the child is but the reflection of the older, tho in a milder form or in a smaller way, as it brings out only what exists in yourself—here you see yourself as in a glass—besides, it should not be considered that they are as able to control the feelings and the like, as one older, yet in your temper you "yank" them for their temper. Evil applies to all alike, nevertheless, we excuse ourselves by saying, "I am older than you, child." Only a Perfect teacher can be a Perfect example, so be careful, lest you convict yourself. It is time the old mythological doctrine of "save the rod and spoil the child" be abolished, unless we wish it raised upon ourselves, that is "save the rod" and spoil the man, that the child may be spoiled also. We can now apply a more modern parable very appropriately. Jesus said "cast out first the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote that is in thy brother's eye." Also, "for a good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit, neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." If your child (fruit) be not perfect, look to yourself for the imperfection.

Judging by the present evilmindedness of the younger generation, it is about time to look within ourselves, rather than to the child, and not "without," to find the really injurious uncleanliness.

The Sanitary inspector visits a "sweat shop" or any place under the fire of inspection, looking here and there with the idea of "cleaning house." He believes he has finished his work of inspection

after the general routine, and of course he has so far as Sanitary Law is concerned, the only thing of which he has any knowledge. The factory may have needed all the cleaning out and other things imposed upon it by the inspector. But he did not make an inspection of those employed, only in a casual way, and then only believing their "careworn look" and unhealthy state was due to the filthy environments. Especially, is the result of evil-mindedness more noticeable in the expression of boys and girls between the age of sixteen and twenty. In the enforcement of our Sanitary Laws we forget, like "the Pharisee," that the first necessary step toward "house cleaning," should be to rid the mind of all uncleanliness, ("To eat with unwashed hands defileth not the man") else, "Ye make clean the outside of the cup and platter, but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness. "Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also." The outside of the body will be clean—free from the worst forms of disease and "pimples," if the inside—Consciousness—be free from Evil; while the mild forms of disease are a natural condition due to the laws of Decay in the form of Nature. To any one who has given special attention to persons employed in a factory, or at whatever position in life, they need only to observe the fact that back of all their "careworn look" and unhealthy bodily conditions, you can trace the same as a result of evilmindedness, and I dare say in your own experience it is often so, if you wish to put it to the test and acknowledge it. It is more noticeable among the

poorer people and class of workers or those who receive little for their work, because they are naturally poorly fed; and, since food is a necessary acquisition to the building up of that waste and organ made void thru over indulgence, so, they are naturally less able to stand excessive indulgence, and so likewise are they the object of disease accordingly. Show me a person who is nervous and irritable, and I will show you a person of the above type. This solves the problem of the different blood diseases, since temper curdles the blood as an acid curdles milk. The mind is the big factor in the case, because it decides the kind of disease when the body is in a condition to be subject to the disease named, or, you read the "symptoms" of a disease, and you begin to feel that you have the case referred to.

I remember several years ago while traveling thru Pennsylvania, there was occasion to visit the resident district of a mining town of about twenty thousand inhabitants. More than two-thirds of the population lived in unsanitary environments, and in fact some localities, especially the alleys termed streets, were really nauseating because of the odor emanating from the filth. Even its main streets were strewn with waste and the like, which, I was told, was seldom carried away. Here was a town thoroly saturated with what the average person would call filth, nevertheless, a one-time Chief of Police with whom I was stopping, informed me that the town had the least per cent. of sickness in the State, and was on record to that fact, which is a good proof that filth is not the ORIGINAL CAUSE of disease.

Let us make a diagnosis of the case in another way. For an illustration, we have a radius of one-fourth of a mile, and within this location reside fifty persons with the best sanitary conditions. We have the same radius in another location very thickly populated—even one thousand would be a low estimate if we considered what is called "the tenement district," and of course this is not thoroly free from filth. Ten cases of small-pox are reported from this district, and naturally enough a great cry goes up that it is because of the unsanitary conditions. But have we taken into consideration that, according to the population of the two places, there could exist twenty cases in the latter, and yet the per cent. of sickness would be the same, or, there need be no case of sickness in the former. Really, we have more disease to-day than when there was nothing known about Sanitary Law, germs, and "swat the fly." It is necessary to give the report some credence because it represents a good and necessary work, since, "cleanliness is next to godliness," and some are sincere workers, besides, it requires such a report to bring forth the necessary funds to carry on the work, the offices of which are so readily sought and filled by willing workers. I have just read in our daily press:—"Contagion in the city shows an increase." Rather amusing, isn't it? Here we have a city claiming—and I believe it to be, one of the cleanest and most "Sanitary" of any in the State, yet, contagion is on the increase. And it is the same old similar excuse of "mortals" not wishing to "know the Truth," as the article reads in part, "continued heat during the last week is

believed to have an effect," as tho there were no avenues by which to escape diseased conditions; unless there be "ANOTHER CHANGE IN THE WEATHER," forever dodging the Truth, for, "to know the truth will make you free," since, if we had to depend on the weather, and such like, there would be little hope for the better.

Is it not time then in which to teach another Law laid down by the greatest teacher of his time? Hardly, since it would convict ourselves in that we would have no excuse to continue in what we call pleasure, or, "If I had not come and spoken unto them they had no sin, but now they have no cloak for their sin." But we could listen in part to this Truth and at the same time enforce our Sanitary Laws in reference to cleanliness, and by so doing we shall "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." If Jesus had not revealed and also predicted a Higher Idea—Christ Life than what is termed "Natural," or the Lower Idea—Adam life then and now lived, it is safe to say that ere this time the whole generation would have been idiotic from abuse of nature, because the lower instinct and brute nature was rampant, as the words in many parables signify, and as is illustrated by the words of Paul, in Romans; 1: 26, 27, of which some of the hereditary conditions exist to-day. Jesus was the first and only one to recognize this, and so he gave up "HIS LIFE," THE NATURAL WAY OF LIVING, and therefore "DIED FOR US" in order to "SAVE THE WORLD" from such conditions. You need go no farther than your neighborhood, and I may say

your own household, to hear remarks as a result of either existing Evil and its practise, nor is it confined to the elders, but natural enough is handed to the children, in fact it is the bulk of conversation in many groups of the old and very young. We have thru experience failed to form a Knowledge of "The signs of the times" referred to by Jesus, tho, as he says, "Ye can discern the face of the sky" thru observation. We apply Physical Science when we should use Mental Science, for, and thru our experience and observation we ought to be able to "discern" the cause of disease by "THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES," because of the asylums and hospitals which stand as a land-mark to it.

Ignorance in everything is being replaced with Knowledge. People who thru ignorance have been and are paying most all their living to religion and the like, thereby starving themselves while those few to whom they give their all are living in luxury, are becoming wise to the fact that it is not necessary to buy the Truth, or to erect expensive monuments to it. Jesus taught the multitude and said "the poor have the gospel preached to them," which is evidence that only "well to do" persons were allowed to attend Church, besides, it illustrates the fact that he could not obtain a hearing in the Church. We might here turn our attention to "alms" and "prayer," as they have been so much misused in taking advantage of the ignorant; I say ignorant, because if they had a Knowledge of the Truth and to what this money was really used for, they would not give it. "Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of

them, otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven." "Therefore, when thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee as the hypocrites do in the synagogues, and in the streets that they may have the glory of men, Verily, I say unto you, they have their reward." How truly this illustrates the form of "giving" as we see it to-day. When man gives alms "to be seen of men" it is generally for OUTWARD SHOW, therefore, they have "THEIR REWARD" because that was all it was given for. If the alms are given with a spirit of Good for the cause, it IS "the reward of the Father," because it is in harmony with the Father—Thought of doing a Good act. You will note here how synonymous all the words, such as Father, Thought, Good are applicable to the Cause of an act in connection with man acting accordingly. Why is it that Societies work thru this channel of OUTWARD SHOW for receiving help? Simply because they know the weakness of mortality—man in the sight of man—thereby incriminating themselves and those women whom Societies employ to work man in gaining alms, since it is an evil method by which they secure help ACCORDING TO THE ABOVE PASSAGE, and not because I think and say so here. They—the heads of Societies, etc., are pleased to "sound a trumpet"—allow it to be seen of men when in the act of giving, if they can gain money by so doing. I remember when attending a Church recently, that, during the hour for service, a large amount of money was asked for by the minister. One man gave a thousand dollars, and then the minister "SOUNDED

A TRUMPET" by saying "Mr. Jones gives a thousand dollars," and then, more trumpets were sounded, for, Mr. Jones and others, were not the only persons present who wished notoriety, or outward show, which, according to Jesus, is hypocritical to the Spirit of almsgiving. The woman who "gave all her savings" only illustrates the Spirit of giving, but does not signify that man should give if he is not able to do so, or unless he wishes to do so, tho he is taught in that light, and sometimes made poor, while those who receive the money, invariably use it for selfish aims, besides, no man with any reason can understand why he should be a slave to poverty to become a Christian. The kind "to be seen of men" is worked in the streets by Societies, also, Hospitals, and some of the latter even go so far as to label man with a tag, like unto a dog tax, and yet, we are told not to let "the right hand know what the left hand doeth." "They have their reward." The free giving by this method is the cause of increased "Relief Societies" which are springing up continually, since many persons are pleased to hold the position in office at high salaries that are connected with them, and they are about the only persons generally benefited. It is conceded that only about thirty per cent. is used for "charity," while the seventy per cent. is paid out for the expense of maintaining the Charity Organization. The business firms are so annoyed by the solicitors for this and that, that they are beginning to cry against it, and yet they dare not speak their mind too freely, for fear of their business being impaired by what these persons may say

if they do not give to some things they are opposed to. These persons know this; and so continue in their hypocrisy—hypocrisy because they know they are taking advantage of the business man's situation, who assists things sometimes that he would not assist otherwise, because it may be against his views, and to support anything contrary to your view may be to hinder Progress. Just so long as man is greedy—and we are now living in the age of greed—for gain of money and power over his fellow man, just that long will Charity exist, and no longer, since, to recognize more equality in the distribution of profits, so will such equality and more social relations remove charity, because charity will have no chance to exist where such social economics exist. Only when we come into the understanding above the view held by the ignorant, as illustrated by the woman when she said: "yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table," then, will charity begin to cease. The ignorant—poor—will not look up to charity as their end, but to the conditions which cause such an end.

To-day, the individual begger seeking help from persons on the street, even when he really needs and ought to have assistance, is arrested, while those in the same business, but under the guise of some charity organization, are allowed to go unmolested. In speaking of Charity, Emerson rightly says, "There is a class of persons to whom by all spiritual affinity I am bought and sold; for them I will go to prison if need be,—but your miscellaneous popular charities,—the education at college of fools; the building of meeting-houses to the vain end

to which many now stand, alms to sots, and thousand-fold Relief Societies;—tho I confess with shame I sometimes succumb and give the dollar, it is a wicked dollar, which by and by, I shall have the manhood to withhold."

We have here found that "almsgiving" is not a help to spiritual growth, and I will follow by giving a few hints as to prayer used to as much profit, or that audible and knee praying has "received its reward," because it is nothing more than a "noise" and a stimulant which only benefits like a medicine as a stimulant benefits the sick person at THE TIME TAKEN, but does not really cure the sick any more than a prayer will cure the sinful. The word prayer in its true definition is DESIRE. I believe this is also the definition given by Mrs. Eddy. Jesus said, "this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting." My definition of the word "fasting" is abstaining. Therefore, the only "prayer and fasting" is a DESIRE TO, and an ABSTAINING from a thing which will bring results. This prayer and fasting refers to the sexual indulgence, and is the REAL FLESH to have a desire to and abstain from in order to be healed of the conditions referred to by Jesus in this passage. In other words, the one wishing to be healed had indulged too freely of the brute nature, and it was therefore necessary to hold aloof from such if he wished to be healed, or, there was no chance of being healed unless he did give up the flesh, which is not the flesh of animals to abstain from. Jesus said, "Pray to your Father in secret" because Desire to be as the Thought, is significant that your wish is fathered by the desire, and

"secret" because within, or that all things are secrets until observed as without, or in the world, and proving the inefficiency of audible prayer because Thought only works as it IS Thought.

There is no reason then in praying, but, having the DESIRE TO BE Good or God, necessarily confirms the idea that you will be "WITH YOUR FATHER,"—the Truth of ONE BEING in ONE THOUGHT, and you receive the answer, because you will not "ask amiss," as you always do when you pray—you miss the true mark.

We will now turn our attention to "the day of judgment." Again, we employ the word Resurrection, because, to have a Knowledge of the day of judgment, is to know it refers to the day of understanding which we have now reached, therefore, "the resurrection" and understanding that we are not to be judged according to our works here, at some future time. To illustrate the fact that judgment can be defined as understanding, we will place a prisoner in a court room. The case is argued, and before the jury can pass judgment, they must have a thoro understanding of the case, or the case is understood and judged then and there, or on the same day, or at the same time, so, we are judged and condemned hourly in some form of punishment. The prisoner is not always judged and condemned as he may expect to be, nor are we judged and condemned hourly as we may expect to be, or as it looks to us sometimes when we see a person is not caught at once and condemned as we think he ought to be dealt with, which is simply a matter of changed conditions, and whatever the conditions are, he can only be subject

to it, whether it be freedom, or whether it be bondage.

The day of judgment then has its connection with the "second coming," because in the day of understanding we have a better judgment of what the second coming refers to. To illustrate, we will say that a prophecy is fulfilled by the tendency to believe in the thing prophesied, as thought develops by holding in conscience the thing to be. Even the individual when told by the ordinary "fortune teller" that they are going to experience that or this, or marry a certain person, will come true sometimes. They are told a certain type of person will marry them, and so this thought is continually with them, and being conscious of the same it works to an end. It begins to work more as soon as some person of that type appears (the same person might have appeared heretofore, but could make no real impression because no special thought of them), and they begin to plan to meet, because such was told them, and such may continue until the prophecy come true. The prophecy, or "the second coming" is the general opinion, and therefore has been an aid in bringing about the second coming, but not in the form of Jesus, but in the form of a better understanding of what Truth is. So then, the "second coming" in one Sense is possible NOW, because of the Sense of what Truth is in its final meaning, but not in the same meaning—form of Jesus, since, it cannot "COME BY OBSERVATION," as they and some of us have believed. As stated heretofore in regard to "disease," the Truth could not be accepted in the time of Jesus when many persons came to

him to be healed, which was done in order that he might impress them with the true doctrine. Therefore, it would be necessary for the "second coming,"—That is, history would repeat itself in that there would come "plagues" and the like thru living "after the flesh," and again, people would seek the Truth more than in the time in which he lived. You ask why your belief will not come true as to "the second coming" of Jesus in the form of "the Christ," and I reply, "because your belief is the result of a selfish Thought." In other words, you look for a person—"a sign when no sign shall come"—and a person or yourself to be benefited by the same, Yet, your belief has had much to do with the Truth, or second coming, in that it seems to require about so much of self or nature, to aid the Truth as Paul said "MY LIE" is a help to the truth. Your surprise will be and is that the second coming refers to the same Truth Jesus taught is for ALL to "overcome the world" as Jesus did, and Paul made reference to it when he said "I wish all men were even as I myself." It is said "the son of man cometh not by observation," or, "the kingdom of God cometh not by observation," therefore, "the son of man" is but the Truth concerning man, for you could not connect these two passages in any other way, because both "come not by observation,"—in the form of man. My definition of the word "Kingdom" is Spirit, and it will apply to any passage where kingdom is used.

If we would consider more that which builds up a character for man, instead of looking for such a character in man, or that he ought to be so and

so irrespective of how he should go about to obtain such an end, we might realize some change for the better. But we condemn each other; looking at a character no worse than our own, and also excuse ourselves with the idea that we are all "BORN IN SIN," thereby making little, if any chance for improvement along the line of reformation.

Now the fault lies in the fact that man has been unable to grasp the true definition of himself, because he looked too much at what is created in the Physical or animal alone, rather than to the Thought and Mental as the Cause which either builds or destroys the character of man, and then builds or destroys the body also. We read books and books on "Physical Culture," and see as a result of this, a "parade" of "fools" as Emerson would say, half naked and running on the main thorofares. It is a "display" of the Physical, but shows a weakness of the Mental. This might have been practical years ago, but the Physical is on its "last Legs" in trying to impress the world that it still holds a great prestige, for, the age of Mentality is fast outdoing it, in that it is the greatest power with the least exertion. A true Metaphysician watching the growth of the Mental, cannot escape the fact that the Physical is fast losing its significance. He is above his fellow physical, in that it is not a wonder to him that man is continually losing his physical power—the muscles, since he is growing less in need of them. It does not seem a miracle to him that the pyramids of Egypt cannot be moved to-day by a machine, since the machine has not developed that power as yet,

nor that it was impossible for man to place them there by physical means, because they were stronger physically than we are physical and mentally so. It is only because we are getting weaker physically, that it is necessary for the growth of the machine which is the result of Mental growth. Neither does this signify that we are weaker, but really is significant of greater power, since the Mental will replace the Physical with greater strength as we look to it more than we do to the Physical.

Man has considered himself or the form as something in reality, when it is nothing, ("Ye are as sheep for the slaughter"), for, if he sails with integrity, he becomes upright, and to sail with impurity is to become impure. He looks for himself in a mirror to find there only a shadow of a doubt, because he has not found there that which is real. He believes in himself because he sees something there that looks real, when in reality it is only a shadow of what ought to be real. If he had looked within the veil of understanding, he would have FORMED therein a Soul or Sense of Thought which is the builder of man, but NOT THE MAN, or HIMSELF, yet, himself by justification, because the Thought is ever the "Father" to the fact or *vice versa*. It is not that we shall spend our time in idle dreams, and then expect to awake to glorified Being, or a something we had no part in building. If we stand in the path of Progress, we become stagnant, because we are playing with stagnation. You might say, "what have I to do with Progress?" and I reply, "very little or very much in the nature of an animal." Progress is a

Universal Law working, and Truth is Universal, yet, neither are Universally used as such. There is a class of persons who do not believe in liberty in all things, and such cannot Progress, because they are in Error and false. To oppose liberty means bondage, and to bind one to a given thing whether it be a fact or no, is to stop Progress, and therefore hinder Truth. Mr. Ingersoll gives a good illustration of Progress in his talk on "The Ghosts." He says, "Montaigue, a man blest with so much common sense that he was the most uncommon man of his time, was the first to raise a voice against torture in France. But what was the voice of one man against the terrible cry of ignorant, infatuated, superstitious and malevolent millions? It was the cry of a drowning man in the wild roar of a cruel sea. In spite of the efforts of the brave few, the infamous war against the freedom of the Soul was waged until at last one hundred millions of human beings—fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters—with hopes, loves, and aspirations like ourselves, were sacrificed upon the cruel altar of an ignorant faith. Every nerve of pain was sought out and touched by the belief in Ghosts.

"For my part I glory in the fact, that here in the new world—in the United States—the liberty of conscience was first guaranteed to man, and that the constitution of the United States was the first great decree entered in the high court of human equity forever divorcing Church and State—the first injunction granted against the interference of the Ghosts. This was one of the grandest steps ever taken by the human race in the direction of Progress.

"You will ask what has caused this wonderful change in three hundred years. And I answer—the inventions and discoveries of the few,—the brave thoughts, the heroic utterances of the few,—the acquisition of a few facts.

"You must remember that every wrong in some way tends to abolish itself. It is hard to make a lie stand always. A lie will not fit a fact. It will only fit another lie made for the same purpose. The life of a lie is simply a question of time. Nothing but Truth is immortal."

When I look about me and see men who have never given a hand toward Progress and Truth in anything, I think how fortunate for such that there are progressive persons with inventive ideas—thoughts. These persons do not seem to realize the fact that their happiness is due to the few, and would even scorn if you hinted to them it is a fact, for they too believe they have had a share in making Progress.

I said to a friend recently that the time is coming when there will be no cemeteries, because the work of cremation shall be the universal method in the disposition of the dead. He replied: "What an insane idea." But he is one of those who looks only to nature and present methods formed by usage, and if told before electricity came into use, that such would be possible some day; would have said, what an insane idea. Here again, I might turn from the direct subject, yet, it is a part of the subject in explanation, since Cremation is a form of Knowledge and understanding, and will be more so in the day of increased judgment. With all the floral displays and monumental architecture,

the cemetery is not in line with Progress, nor is it conductive to happiness and civilization, but is looked upon and made a part of civilization thru PAST CUSTOM. It is really but a remembrance of that which should not be remembered, since it does not contribute anything towards happiness, nor a relief from pain, but is ever the source of one kind of pain and unhappiness. But some persons are never happy unless they are in pain, or suffer, because they "believe" some such things are "sent from God," and therefore necessary and right to suffer. If it were not for what some one would say and think if we did not pay such tribute to the dead, there would even now be much less following to the cemetery. We do so much for custom and formality sake, that we forget what is, or overlook what is reasonable, and thereby hinder Progress in another form. I agree that many persons would have to look elsewhere for employment and other business, if the cemetery was abolished, but this is characteristic of all changes being made along the line of Reformation and Progress. I believe too, that there are many in the business for the money and business end of it, and not because they believe in its more proper disposition of the dead. The word "Sanitary" which is really a farce to-day in most cases, is used to represent health conditions, and I should think it ought to serve in connection with the disposition of the dead, as in all animal and decayed matter. Granting that you are "greater than many sparrows" when the body manifests life, you are no more than many sparrows when the body is in a state of decay, or, "ye are as sheep for the slaugh-

ter." I rather have those of my friends remember me when alive to the fact that I may appreciate it, and so do not care to be seen or remembered when I cannot appreciate it, since the body is nothing to be admired while in a state subject to decay. The last time I care to see any one, or to remember them is when I see them moving as a body, for it is only then that I can care for, or do anything to assist them. I believe so much in the life of man, and nothing in a dead body that I trust my body shall be given to some hospital for any purpose they may see fit, if I do not leave behind me the necessary funds for Cremation. So then, we should not be expected to associate with dead things, or things unlike ourselves. It would be just as well and reasonable for you and your friends to be left so, because those alive are only harboring something which shall not make them happy, and certainly of no help to those gone, because you are on an entirely different plane of existence. I know this idea will be repulsive to some, yet, these very same persons and friends who are now repulsed by this remark, will gossip and quarrel and even in some cases make life miserable for their friend and folk now, and then try and pay tribute, or give in return a few tears and flowers and a burial when they pass away.

You, who will feel repulsed by the above idea, which may seem too radical, cannot be more repulsed than those who heard the same thing nearly two thousand years ago, nor should you be so if you really and truthfully believed in the teachings of Jesus. When Jesus was teaching, "The disciple said to him, Lord, suffer me first to go and

bury my father," at which Jesus replied, "follow me and let the dead bury the dead." While this refers to "the dead" idea of what LIFE IS and has been preached to us, as life, it also proves there is nothing gained in spending time with a dead body, since it cannot reveal any knowledge, nor impart a growth to man in the way of what builds up. I have failed to see where sighing and mourning over "SPILLED MILK" has brought any good results, or happiness to those who sigh and mourn. I know when my father and mother passed away I could not sign nor mourn their loss because I knew they were then out from under the bond of sickness and a condition that could not be relieved otherwise, and so, really felt a RELIEF FOR THEM, and by so doing, was relieved myself from the effects of sighing and mourning. Let us therefore remember to HELP NOW "the widows and orphans."

Religion has ever been a part to hinder Progress. That is, it has in some form or other withheld a thinking public, as is illustrated in the words of Ingersoll. Martin Luther had a clearer and better Conscience, or was Conscious of a better God-Thought than others of his time, therefore "The Reformation." It was a grand revival when he said, "let the scriptures be put in the hands of everybody; let every one interpret them for himself, according to the light he has; let there be private judgment—let spiritual liberty be revived, as in Apostolic days." I am not saying but what there are good qualities in all creeds, or but what most of them to-day are upholding with sincerity what they believe is religious. But a Religion

that is void of Reason according to experience and observation of things as they present themselves to a more scientific and progressive age cannot expect to live and thrive forever. Altho Galileo, Copernicus and many other known Philosophers "inaugurated the era which led to progressive improvements in the physical conditions of society," and made wonderful astronomical discoveries, they were cruelly dealt with by religious leaders. But they were able to prove what they knew and thought, and their Knowledge and Works have lived, while the religious views have and are changing,—and it is because of the religious view making a change, that their works and ideas as well as others are more universally believed. So, "Creed," or the different Religions, in my estimation, means separation from a fact, since they express more than One Idea by the very name creed—which is impossible to be so in the Science of an established Principle. Neither do I aim to condemn another, or a Religion because I seem to differ here from another. I only use their views in pointing out my Knowledge of the Truth—If you have followed me thru all the chapters, you have found that "I blame no man," but that the conditions are due to Evolution along the Natural and Spiritual lines of growth, as signified by the words of Jesus when he said "if a man hear my words and do them not, I condemn him not." I fully realize with Jesus that no man is to blame if he be Catholic or Protestant. Whatever the subject may be, he is the object of that subject, whether it be Protestant or Catholic. If I take on a condition different than another, or change

from what I have been, it is because of conflicts between several conditions being analyzed to whatever produces one. I employ the words Knowledge and ignorance to denote distinction and not to claim you have no knowledge, or that you are ignorant. You are simply ignorant of what my Knowledge is of the Truth, and until you can prove to me that your knowledge is the Truth, then, your knowledge is a case of ignorance to me. But I believe I have proof that my Knowledge is the Truth by what I am able to prove in experience, while your knowledge has outgrown its truthfulness. When talking with a friend on this subject of belief, he asked, "Do you believe others as well as you, are correct in some of their views?" I replied, "I believe there are persons who are correct in some of their views; but when I think they are correct in any of their views, then, that is my view and belief also." But for me to agree in all of their views, is for me to give up my views. If I did not think "I am" correct in ALL of my views, then, I need not write, since I would and could only write of some one else. If Jesus had agreed with the views of others instead of what he experienced and believed, he would not have been ridiculed and put to death, as all who have "talked before their time"—been able to look to the future, or understand present facts by experience of such in times when people were governed by Religion, or had power in their hands to say whether a man should be put to death for his Knowledge. Jesus aimed to continually live the Spiritual Life during the teaching, and his disciples were "sent by him," and not that they were any better morally

than others. Neither could Jesus have lived the Spiritual Life so much more than others, if he had not given the whole of "his life"—the Natural belief—up to the teaching and preaching of it, and because he was born under the Spiritual belief and environment of a mother who gave her time and study to a Higher Life than what was ordinarily lived. The remark made by Jesus that "ye cannot serve two masters," signifies you cannot have ONE ONLY in the Conscience and "serve it" continually, while both Good and Evil are preached to you as it is to-day. In other words, it is not necessary to preach Evil, in order to destroy it; in fact, the preaching of it will be the life of it, because you cannot destroy a thing until you fail to recognize it. Preaching Good and Evil is typified by a gathering of men and women. The conversation may have opened on a good subject, but soon, one of the party opens the conversation with an evil subject, and all fall in the net. If they had known only the one, or had only God—Good in its true meaning preached to them, they could talk of nothing else. If you gave a scholar the subject of Geography continually, it stands to Reason, Understanding, Judgment and Knowledge that it would know nothing of Arithmetic. To-day we have the understanding and therefore the judgment that the Natural is against the Spiritual—"THE FLESH LUSTETH AGAINST THE SPIRIT"—because all destructive and diseased conditions are the result of the Natural, or belong to the Natural. Thru this understanding and judgment, we receive the Knowledge that the Spiritual Life TO BE and

"IS NOT," is the life to be lived here, therefore, this Knowledge is the "Second Coming of Christ." We can now Understand and Judge the meaning of the following parable. "There shall be two in the field, the one shall be taken, and the other left. "Two women shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Watch therefore; for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." In other words, one out of a family shall understand and believe what Jesus taught, since one is more able to "DISCERN THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES" than they were in his day, therefore, "the second coming." For this reason there shall be discord in families as it is to-day, which is referred to in the following passages. "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword." (Truth cuts as a two edged sword when it comes in contact with Error.) "For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. "And a man's foes shall be they of his own household." How truly this applies to those who have accepted the Spiritual teaching as is generally given in "Christian Science" and those who oppose it, or, live up to the old "Doctrine." In all these years of preaching to man that he should overcome sin, we have at the same time applied that he was "born in sin," and therefore, try to destroy a quality he was born under—a very serious proposition I declare. But we have observed if a man lives under certain evils and conditions contrary to that which produces a more Perfect growth, that such cannot

live in peace and harmony, even tho he is not in sin, or is not the individual Cause of the so termed sinful conditions that exist. It is reasonable to believe then, that such a man cannot live forever, or hereafter, since he has not, nor CANNOT live wholly according to a given Rule that is Eternal —neither did Jesus. The same candle (body or form) does not exist forever, but the light still exists by another candle of the same making, yet, not the same light by expression of the candle is it greatest, because Time creates or develops another and more perfect light as shown in the electric. But the candle still exists and is used by some, even tho not such a perfect light, and this light or spirit of the candle to-day, is expressed by other candles when that candle is burned out, just as the OLD BELIEF is expressed and lived by some who hold the ancient view of life. A piece of coal expresses heat, but the piece of coal that did express heat, has been replaced by another piece of coal because the former had the heat and light burned out of it,—yet, the same heat—life and light, but not the same piece of coal. The piece of coal is an auxiliary to heat at present, as Matter is an auxiliary to Thought at present, since the Material means are necessary until the Spiritual or Thought—God becomes Absolute or Wholly, or the One life, as it says "First that which is Natural, and afterward that which is Spiritual." While Satan is derived thru the Material, it is not of the Material, any more than God is of the Material, but is Thought, and thru this Material seen as Thought does it receive its name Natural, and so God as Thought derives its Cause thru the Ma-

terial also, but is not of the Material either, but, and because and thru the destructive principle of the Natural as Temporal as Thought, is God seen and known as Eternal Thought. The "belief" that man dies in order to become Spiritual hinders "the word of God," because the Word can never be Realized as that of Perfection in the form of man, unless demonstrated so in the Visible Life of Man, as it is illustrated so in the remark made by John,—"The word was made flesh and dwelt among us," which does not necessarily refer to Jesus, other than that the Word could not be distinguished only by form, and Jesus MAN-ifested this Thought —God as the TRUE WORD OF LIFE. Do you imagine a Perfect building could arise from a pile of stone without the aid of help? Man could not rise to Perfection from imperfection without aid. How then can death put on life? neither could life put on death and then put on life again. Life is never extinct in any form. The Principle of Thought is Perfect in a Sense, yet if it had nothing to work upon which is the shape of man, or you,—it could no more produce a Perfect Form of Completeness, or become so as Visible, than the plan of a building could be Perfectly constructed without the aid of material.

In Revelation 20: 6, we read,—"Blessed and holy IS he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power." The end of the Natural condition, or propagation period, is the death referred to here, which is "the end of the world," and not the general "belief" that the world is to be destroyed. Now, it stands to reason in my opinion that at the end of the propagation

period, there shall be no death, since death can only exist so long as propagation exists, for, if there is nothing breeding, there is nothing dying. The opinion of Mrs. Eddy is that this "death" refers to you and I, but I contend it can only allude to Nature and man in "the latter days." She says in substance, that "I may die now—pass away—but thru my claiming or demonstrating NOW, or before death, that I —"man is spiritual and not material,"—and tho I die now, I will not die but overcome what here is called "the second death." HERE AND NOW is the fact that death—the natural condition of life is to be destroyed, and then is "the second death." If this referred to man or you specifically, how could the term "second," here be used? Since, SECOND DEATH signifies that which HAS taken place, and not that it is GOING to take place with YOU hereafter, or later, but WILL TAKE PLACE WITH THINGS THAT EXIST later. It does not read "over such," DEATH hath no power, but that the SECOND DEATH "HATH NO POWER," therefore, referring to the Natural condition which is destroyed, and "HATH NO POWER" BECAUSE IT IS DESTROYED, since life in all forms of life HATH POWER so long as it exists. So I repeat: "Blessed is he that hath part in the first resurrection"—SOME of the Knowledge, or "part" of the Knowledge of the Spiritual Life to be lived here, which Truth has been and is the First Death, as referred to in Rev. 1: 18, "I am he that liveth and was dead,"—not understood, therefore the FIRST DEATH. And "ON SUCH" or God known because it is Eternal

Life, "the second death" or Satan and the Material Conditions known because it is Temporal Life "hath no power" because its power is ended in the "SECOND DEATH." It is absurd to connect what she calls death, or what we call death with what I call the first death, because the death of a thing is the end of that thing, but not the end or death of Eternal Thought—God. The candle is but the name of the form of light given by the candle, and man is but the name of the form of Spirit or Thought given by the man. Paul's remark illustrates this, for he said,—"When this mortal shall have put on immortality, death shall be swallowed up in victory." Paul could not "put on" the entire State of Immortality in its FINAL SPIRITUAL FORM, nor did he say so, just because it reads "this mortal," which same is to signify a later period than the time in which Paul lived, or, "WHEN." It refers to ALL MORTALITY as well as ALL IMMORTALITY, in that all mortality must be destroyed before all immortality can be lived, and that there is no other place than HERE where "this mortal can put on immortality." What Sense would there be to the argument of teaching that this mortal was to be overcome, if it were not to be overcome here? Neither do I claim because it says "when this mortal shall put on immortality," that the mortal can "put on" immortality, since, flesh is flesh, and cannot put on, nor even turn to anything unlike its own. This term is but to illustrate that the mortal shall be REPLACED by the immortal condition, "WHEN" the Thought is Wholly existing as a Spiritual body. Mortal, in all forms

of organic life, subsists on mortality, or flesh, so to speak, in order to exist as mortality. In one sense, a term applied to eternal life—mortality is eternal as by a growth it continues to exist or works to its own end, when it is no more eternal when that end is reached. But man, will in time, thru Thought—God—be able to overcome the mortal, when it destroys in him the Natural, until finally—at "the end of the world"—mortality, all Nature requiring food for its existence shall be destroyed, for the Thought as God and Man will then exist as it IS Spiritual,—in the Form of a Spiritual Body. The Thought will eventually destroy all desire of the flesh, and the organs which constitute and create desire—nature, so there can be no desire for the Natural, and the Spiritual so termed can then exist without the so termed Natural. To say—according to Mrs. Eddy and some of those claiming to be Mental Scientists, that "there is no matter," or "it is only a belief," and that disease and the like are only a belief, and are directly due to "man made laws," is too absurd for consideration. Jesus said, "I can of myself do nothing" because man and all animal life in organic form is subject to diseased conditions so long as the Natural condition of organic life and the propagation period exists. But because the diseased conditions are due to the Natural condition, you aid in destroying the same by overcoming as much as possible the Cause of such conditions by affirming the Truth of and Eternal Thought of Life known as the Spiritual, or to be known as the Spiritual. Of course, disease is a "man made law," as man—the mortal exists under

the Natural law of disease and death, and because of a Conscience he MUST MAKE THE LAWS ACCORDINGLY, or he must make the laws which are made only according to the conditions that exist. But not that he is necessarily the INDIVIDUAL AUTHOR of the conditions or laws that exist, because these existed LONG BEFORE MAN EXISTED, since, man was the last formation, and could not make any laws, or know anything about them until he had a Knowledge of Good and Evil, for it is reasonable to believe that the animal and primitive man were subject to disease long before man became Conscious of Creation. To claim man is the Cause or Origin of these conditions, or makes the laws individually and independently, (the form or building can make no laws), and then tell him to "overcome them," is too absurd for consideration. Jesus would not have said you should "overcome the world" if man made the laws, or, if God were and is responsible for Creation, since This Command contradicts such an idea, for, there would be no sense in trying to "overcome" a thing that Man and God made, because you cannot place a thing above its own, or superior to its own. So I term organic life in the term or form of Creation and propagation or animal life, which CANNOT RISE HIGHER THAN ITS OWN, and if it were not for the Higher Thought or God, the primitive man would still be a primitive man or no higher than the animal. So, the material and diseased conditions will exist so long as the Natural conditions or evil exists. I say, Natural Evil, because, even tho it is according to Nature, or propagation is

Natural and necessary until the Spiritual becomes Absolute, yet, "THE FLESH LUSTETH AGAINST THE SPIRIT." But we are not condemned hereafter (no hereafter) for what we, or man is unable to avoid under existing conditions, because we are what these conditions are HERE and NOW. But by aiming to destroy the Natural Condition, You as God will have "PART" or SOME KNOWLEDGE of how these conditions shall be destroyed, since Thought cannot know the final result and what conditions it shall take on, for, in the words of Jesus: "no man knoweth, not even the Son," and if, according to Jesus, the Son is one with the Father, it stands to reason that the "Father" does not know what shall be, because it is a Thought Working to an end no man can predict to what end it will terminate. Allow me to repeat that the "second death" refers to the Natural condition and propagation period, by repeating the eighteenth verse and first chapter of Revelation. "I am he that liveth and was dead, and, behold, I am alive forever more, amen; and have the keys of hell and death." As said before,—there being no mention of a FIRST DEATH in any of the chapters, yet, a "second death," it here signifies THERE IS NONE, nor could there have been an actual death for Thought, therefore, no real object for mentioning a "first death," yet, a misunderstanding of the Truth in its actuality is a FIRST DEATH to the Truth, which same gives an excuse for mentioning of a "second death," and the fact that the Truth or Good cannot accomplish any Good over that which is Error or Evil, if the latter is upheld as the Truth, or as

much as the Truth, and so the term "second death" is used as an application to the Natural condition. "The keys of hell and death" we should realize NOW from our understanding or judgment, are these Truths, for they—the Truths of Life are the "keys," because they open up the way to destroy the Evils which always end in hell for man NOW, and as long as they exist. Truth Is hell to Error, and necessarily will be "THE END" of it, tho Religion in the name of Christianity would tell us God is a Being or Person who sends man to Hell because HE IS IGNORANT, or seems to work contrary to a law HE DOES NOT UNDERSTAND, neither is he responsible for its origin. We will pretend just for a minute that God is a Personal Being. In this case He must have all the passions and appetites according to Nature and man, because man is "His Image." How he became a Personal Being, we are not supposed to know, neither on whom He devoted and played with passion. But He must have known, as man knows it is impossible after maturity to overcome these passions to a certain degree, and of course being the "Father," He not only ought to know them, but really is to blame for giving the same to his children when He—a supposed "grown up" could not control them; and then, think of sending His children to hell because he uses them. What would you think of a father who, owning a vicious horse, and one he could not control, and knew this, but at the same time handed it over to his little son—perhaps a weakling, to use and care for it? Of course the horse would send the boy to hell quick enough, and one would think his father

wished to get him out of the way, and, for my part I would not think much of such a father. So will Evil, or Satan send a man to hell quick enough, because it IS hell NOW, just as it would be hell Now for the boy with the horse. Paul said, "Our citizenship IS in heaven," and our citizenship IS in hell, in the sense that the former refers to a Good condition and the latter to an Evil condition HERE. "IS," meaning a PRESENT STATE, while the general religious view of WILL BE refers to a FUTURE STATE. Some religious teacher will say this remark by Paul is to affirm that while we are working here, yet in the end "our citizenship is in heaven." How absurd, to believe that no matter how we live here, and the word "our" signifies all persons, or makes no distinction, and so cannot refer to this or that person, that finally, "our citizenship is in heaven," when all have erred, besides, there is no reason for preaching about going to hell, if we are all going to heaven. You cannot go BEYOND YOUR PRESENT STATE, because your Conscience cannot work beyond the present state. Therefore, you cannot be subject to anything beyond your present condition, because there is no beyond, until the beyond or hereafter is reached, and THEN IT IS HERE AND NOW when the beyond or hereafter is reached.

Jesus said, "there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the son of man coming in his kingdom." As stated before the definition of Kingdom is Spirit, and it applies scientifically in every case where the word kingdom is used. Therefore, "the Kingdom of God"

is having "the Spirit of God," and is not a locality, nor an abiding place, or space separate from another, but is a State of Consciousness separate from another State of Consciousness, or, that the Kingdom of God, and the Kingdom of Satan is but the Spirit of either. I will quote the following passages from the New Testament spoken by Jesus, and therefore more authentic than those written in the Old Testament, or those spoken even by Paul and others.

"And when he was demanded by the Pharisees, when the Kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation: Neither shall they say Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the Kingdom of God is within you." (Luke 17: 20-21.) The Pharisees, like the ignorant people, or Pharisees today, who "LOOK FOR A SIGN," shall see no "sign," for they look for a person or a locality. But we find "the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation," for, the Spirit—"Kingdom of God is within you," IF IT BE SO that "the Spirit of God dwelleth in you," instead of the Spirit of Satan. It says in Matthew 6: 10, in connection with prayer, "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven." (i.e.) The Spirit to be Good—God "will be done" according to the Will as it develops Higher, which is to say the Truth shall be universally lived according to Heaven—the Highest conception of life, and not according to the Earth—Lowest conception or Natural life, yet, "IN THE EARTH"—world as it exists. It says, "For nation shall rise against nation, and Kingdom against Kingdom."

The word "nation" signifies the country, and the word "Kingdom" signifies the Spirit of the people of the nation. That is, one country shall fight another country in the form of Good and Evil, or "Kingdom against Kingdom"—Spirit against Spirit—God against Satan. "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then is the Kingdom of God come unto you." The word Kingdom is used here in the sentence so as to avoid the repetition of the word Spirit. So, if I—the Spirit—God cast out devils—evil spirits, by the Spirit that is Good—then this Spirit or Kingdom—God is come unto you—you are Conscious of it, because the Spirit—Kingdom—Evil—Satan is "cast out." "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God." (John 3: 3-5). These quotations from John would indicate by the word "see" and "enter" if taken metaphorically, that there is to be, or will be a locality to behold and enter, but we have SEEN, or may even say we can "see" that it is not a Spirit Kingdom to BEHOLD, other than to SEE IT, or to BEHOLD IT as PRESENT IN the Conscience, since, it "COMETH NOT WITH OBSERVATION" but is "WITHIN YOU." Here, the word "see" signifies that man cannot recognize and live the Spirit unless he is "born of the Spirit," since, he lives under the opposite state of Consciousness when not born into the other, and of course, "CANNOT SEE" because blinded by the other. "Ye have eyes and see not," because you are blinded by the

false idea that you are to "behold" things by observation, when they are to be recognized by the Senses. "Nicodemus answered and said unto him, How can these things be?" Nicodemus was at the head of the Church, but he could not understand how man must be "born again," because of looking on the Physical side of life for man, here, and the Spiritual side of life for man hereafter, when BOTH are to be lived HERE. To be "born again" can only refer to the Mental, because, man cannot as Nicodemus cites: "enter, the second time into his mother's womb, and be born again." Besides; if he must be "born again" only to "SEE" the Kingdom of God as a locality, there would be no rest outside of such a Kingdom. "The woman saith unto him, Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come here to draw," which is the Life or Water no man need thirst after. Jesus asked all to partake of this Water-Life freely, for it is the Water of life, or Life of Life that IS Spiritual, and not WILL BE for "the Natural man." "Jesus answered, my Kingdom is not of this world." (i.e.) The Spirit—God is not of this world—the Natural, because it is not Natural, yet it is in the world, but is not of "this world" which is Temporal. In Revelation it says, "Now is come salvation, and strength, and the Kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ; the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night." In other words, this generation-age has reached the Scientific period wherein the Truth will not continue to be shaken by Error, for the "power of his Christ," or the Idea and

power has "cast down" the old Idea, and its attributes which is the "accuser of our brethren," and the "brethren" are the attributes of the "Christ" or Idea having reached its Power thru the understanding that it is the only Kingdom—Spirit of God—Thought that can live forever. It is said to "Suffer not little children to come unto me, for of such is the Kingdom of heaven." Not that little children are or will be the inhabitants of a place called heaven, but not having reached that state of Consciousness and maturity wherein the Sense of sexual indulgence is; therefore the Spirit of God, is the Spirit—"Kingdom of heaven" expressed by them, since, Truly, the Spirit or Kingdom of heaven "IS WITHIN" them. The above passage illustrates this and nothing more; the children being used to signify the Heaven—Highest State of Consciousness because of the Natural not having developed there, since, it could not exist in the child, until the child had matured. My definition of "Heaven" being the Highest conception of life, and "earth" the Lowest conception of life, so "little children" are of the "Kingdom of Heaven"—Spirit of the Highest conception of life.

Turning back to "there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the son of man coming in his Kingdom;" it is reasonable to believe now that "to taste of death," we must recognize the New—Christ Idea of Life, or "see the son of man coming in his Kingdom"—embodied form of the Spirit of Truth in the form of man which will destroy the Old—Adam Idea, which latter will be the "TASTE OF DEATH" referred to. It is as much as to say that in no generation

can one "taste of death" until the Old Idea had PARTIALLY been destroyed. Jesus referred to this dual life, and death of one—taste of death, when he said, "I lay down my life, that I may take it up again." Of course, the general belief is that this passage refers to some of them he addressed, or to the people in general; that they would live on even after death and then have "renewed" life, but it referred to those present, and others, that they could not receive any part of the New Idea of Truth, until they had abolished part of their Old Idea of Truth. We can with much more reason see how one in any age can lose an old belief—taste of death—when they take on an opposite condition of life, or belief. Jesus said: "But I say unto you, that every idle word that man shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment." You will note it does not say, "that every idle word YOU speak, YOU shall give account of in the day of judgment," but that it is the work of Thought in "man" and in all men as "they," and not necessarily in or of YOU as a responsible individual to suffer. The Truth and Error works thru men, and because of this, "they," certainly, must give account for in the day of judgment, or when the day of understanding is reached when they—the works of Evil shall be destroyed as fast as Good can destroy them, and that man also for that matter, since he is the embodiment of these. So too, the idle words which the Evil speaks Thru you to-day will have to be given account of by man later since, what you speak are those—"they" who follow you are subject to, or inherit what you speak,

until that "idle talk" is gradually overcome by, the Higher Sense of Life and Man.

If we all had an invitation to go to heaven to-night (no such place) there is not one who would accept it, and yet, YOU PREACH THERE IS A HEAVEN and say, IT IS THE ETERNAL PLACE OF HAPPINESS AND REST, and CONTRADICT THIS ASSERTION by taking medicine and the like, to KEEP FROM GOING THERE—what silly rot. Besides, it would be too monotonous, since, even pleasure here becomes a monotony, and, while you may think it would be such a different pleasure along a different channel and for a Being called God, and that it would not become monotonous, it stands to reason that such an existence could not be possible. To accept heaven and hell as localities, other than a locality existing as a condition of life thruout the ages is very absurd. It is true that many have suffered untold agonies because of such a belief, but this does not necessarily make heaven and hell a fact. It is said, "The martyrs cheerfully and heroically endured physical sufferings in view of the glorious crown of which they were assured in the future world." But, when Christianity became more powerful, we find many who did not believe as these SO-CALLED Christians,—(Christian in name only, because Jesus, the teacher of Christianity was opposed to killing to gain an end in anything) that THEY, TOO, SUFFERED UNTOLD AGONIES," at the hands of Christians, and it is even so to-day. Does this not throw BOTH IN THE SAME BALANCE? It was only a matter of who thought they were

right, whether they were right or no, and the most powerful of the two caused the other to suffer. It was not so much so because they were Christians, (they had the same brutal nature in them) that they had to suffer, but because they held to their rights, that is,—each one tried to uphold what they believed were their rights. It did not necessarily make either right because they suffered,—but because they thought they were right, they fought and suffered for their rights. It seems there must always be rivalry, in order to bring about certain things as a natural sequence or following. It was and is a matter of if you do not follow my belief, you must suffer for it, tho all may be wrong, as Emerson says, "Good and bad are names very readily transferable to that or this." But, "wisdom shall be justified of her children," for, Reason shall in time condemn no man to suffer for another's belief, which is partially showing itself to-day in the liberty of belief and thought. Now, let us Reason this in another way than what is ordinarily used as an illustration to point out heaven and hell. We have a man who has all the necessities of life—wealth, health, etc. He believes there is a future heaven for him, and he has a right to believe such, because it is preached to him, and he cannot see or believe otherwise. This places him in a good position HERE and HEREAFTER. Now we have a man who has poor health, and barely an existence in the necessities of life. He believes there is a future heaven for him, and he has a right to believe such, because it is preached to him, and he cannot see and believe otherwise. This places him in a good position ONLY IN THE

HEREAFTER. Now I ask in the name of REASON, can such a conclusion as a heaven or a life hereafter be drawn from such an argument? It is clearly seen by this, or should be seen by the above that there is no such a Person or Being as a God, but that such a condition of life is due as a result of certain opportunities, environments, circumstances—the hereditary and associations during one's life, since, God, nor even a Reasonable man would not throw the burden and hardships upon one person called ignorant and poor. It is said by the MORE ADVANCED PREACHERS in the Church to-day, that "there is no hell or eternal punishment for man," but that, "there is a heaven for man,"—changing the former "belief" of hell. Then I claim it is just as reasonable to argue that there is no heaven for man. There is just as much reason in changing the latter, as the former. If you have preached and do preach one place as the result of living good, then you must preach the other place as the result of living evil, else, BOTH must wind up in the same place. But, people are not always good, neither are they always evil,—nor are there any who are good all the time, and those who are bad all the time,—so it would be, and IS impossible to make any distinction, or that one class shall go to heaven, and that another class shall "go to hell." What you think is good form, may be an evil form to me, and what you think is evil may seem good to me, but ALL must SUFFER and ENJOY, and HERE, according to the Consciousness of both "Good and Evil," and in proportion to their Consciousness of them. Very few animals would suffer if

it were not for man, unless of course it is beast against beast as it is man against man. I am referring to the character and Soul and Sense of man here in regard to God and Satan in dealing with man, and not necessarily to the organic life so to speak. The only thing to blame then, is ignorance. If you ask what caused ignorance, I reply, "It had no cause, but is a matter of fact because we are ignorant," since, Thought and Intelligent development require Time in which to work and develop. There is no other way to distinguish between ignorance and wisdom than by growth it is so, and happy are they who are wise, or not entirely ignorant. It refers to this distinction when it says "Whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder." The life of this body is a great deal a case if you pass along about the time an earthquake takes place, or a trolley car hits your form of existence, that you are dealt with by such incidents, and not because of a God as Cause, nor because of a Satan as Cause. Perhaps too, you are better off by making your exit in this way, since you may escape the effects of a prolonged disease, or a condition that may change your past good life for one of evil. That is, you may leave your good environment and dwell where the evil environment is greatest, and will be subject to it, because many devils—individuals in the form of the One Evil or Satan will have power to throw off the little of Good—God there is in you. Jesus illustrated this—the power of suggestion—when he went "APART TO PRAY." In other

words, he could not have the Desire "to pray" while in company with the disciples, because of their natural tendency in living and thinking more of the flesh, so it was necessary to be "apart" from them, that he might be "alone with God"—Thought of a Higher Life, else he may have been influenced by them in their way of living. That the Devil or Satan—Evil in the form of man "CANNOT STAND" before that Lord or God—Good in the form of man is illustrated by the following in Matthew 8: 31. "So the devils besought him, saying, If you cast us out, suffer us to go AWAY into the herd of swine," which also illustrates the animal or devil is not the life for man as taught by Jesus, or that such a condition is more characteristic of the animal as shown by "the swine." It is then, that man in disease or such bodily conditions shall understand "death is the greatest deliverer" as Job said,—"My Soul chooseth death"—My Sense chooseth death, because my Natural Soul or Sense of a Lower Life cannot stand and live before this Spiritual Soul or Sense of a Higher Life.

Occult Science, like some of the other Sciences, has aimed to find the Truth by looking "within," and so call it "hidden," or a Truth because it is hidden. I argue that there is no existence that can be hidden or within. As Spencer would say, "Because we cannot see that transition has taken place, is proof that it has not taken place." It is proof then that God did not exist the same before the time of Jesus, and when Jesus lived he made known, not an unknown, but a known God, therefore not "hidden" nor "invisible." But, Spencer

should likewise have known that there is no "Unknown," or "Unknown Cause," since nothing exists but that which is known, or, tho it may not be known the same at one time, it is known to change by development, and then is known only differently, but is known just the same. We have an idea that Jesus knew God, and in such a light it is revealed to us, and could not have existed in such a light until the time of Jesus, therefore, nothing hidden since it did not exist until the time of Jesus which we can call the Revelation. It was revealed by him, just as any invention becomes known when it is invented by the inventor, and could not exist until the invention was made known. Some persons, as in Occult Science, believe they see it, or believe it is there because they cannot see it. They "believe" a thing can exist, tho it may be unseen, yet is seen by what they term "insight." But, it is seen by the eye, if they would see it by the things that are made. The things discernible thru Reason being the things that seem to be unseen by the things that are made, for, "He that hath SEEN ME hath SEEN the Father also." In other words, He that hath seen me—the body, hath seen the Thought also, for, I—the body and my Father—Thought are one, since, in no other way, or form can the Thought or Father be expressed, therefore it is not an "Unknown God" or Cause. Nevertheless, when he said at another time, "I can of myself do nothing," he referred to the body as material, and that it is Good and Evil Working, tho, by the body is it seen and known. "Ye have eyes and see not, and ears and hear not," because you have not Reason,

since the eyes are not necessary to see this Truth, nor the ears necessary to hear this Truth, when we understand it is represented by Consciousness, and so called "within," but being without and within also when ONE by MAN-ifestation. You may "believe" the Spirit passes from the body, or lives on, or passes from one body to another after death, but I argue that ONLY LIVING BODIES OF THINGS are the representatives of the things that SEEM TO BE UNSEEN. If God and Satan work; I—body must work also. I cannot be more nor less than "I am." If I reflect life and death principles, then I am the object of such principles. Emerson says, "On my saying, 'What have I to do with the sacredness of traditions, if I live wholly from within?' my friend suggested,—'But these impulses may be from below, and not from above.' I replied, 'They do not seem to me to be such, but if I am the Devil's child, I will live then from the Devil.' No law can be sacred to me, but that of my nature. Good and bad are names very readily transferable to that or this,—the only right is what is after my constitution; the only wrong what is against it."

Jesus "overcome the world," which refers to the sexual, because, it is the only thing he did overcome, and not this, until after "the fast," since he lived as others lived in all other walks of life. Jesus said, "Not every man that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." This "unto me" refers to the Spirit and not Jesus—Jesus speaking of the Spirit as "Lord, Lord." The "my Father" is also my

Thought as Jesus Thought, and therefore the Father of Jesus spoke as the Father—Thought, because it was the Thought—Father of Jesus. This verse admits positively of no excuse, or any hope ("hope is deceiving") for the man who has not lived the Spiritual Life wholly as outlined by Jesus,—(He did not live it Wholly, nor could he, any more than we) only to a greater extent than we, as I shall aim to prove later on. It seems to be characteristic of people to be always looking to this or that person as Superior, and Jesus wished to be excluded from this class, for this is why we have "masters," and this is why people cannot or could not learn to be more equal in the time of Jesus as he taught and wished it so, and so it is to-day. We look up to this or that man, and so we are not equal to him because we have made ourselves unequal, by looking to him as superior We elevate him more than he elevates himself. Emerson says, "When I talked with an ardent missionary and pointed out to him that his creed found no support in my experience, he replied: 'It is not so in your experience, but is so in the other world.' I answer: Other world! There is no Other world. God is one and omnipresent; here or nowhere is the fact." In the following I give the definitions of God, Satan, Angels, Heaven and Kingdom as they follow the quotations from the Bible in uniform.

	Words	Definitions.
Matt. 20:30	"The Angels of God in Heaven	The Thoughts of Spiritual Life are the Highest conception of Life and Immortality.

	Words	Definitions.
Rev. 12:9	"The Angels of. . Satan in the. . . . . Earth.	The Thoughts of Natural Life are the Lowest conception of Life and Mortality.
Luke 17:20	"The Kingdom. . . of God Cometh. . . not with. . . . . Observation.	The Spirit of Thought Cometh not with Observation.
Matt. 16:20	"In the day of Judgment.".	In the day of Understanding.

The day of understanding is upon us, for, we are beginning to understand and—judge which is the Truth. Henry Drummond says, "No man can study Modern Science without a change coming over his view of Truth. What impresses him about nature is its solidity. He is there standing on actual things." In other words, Here in the world can only be experienced that which shall bring about the Truth in anything, since there are no "actual things" to work upon outside of nature. Then, in dealing with the resurrection and angels, I trust you are coming into the realization that here in this verse the word "Angels" are Thoughts, because it associates itself with the word God and Satan. It is absurd to picture angels as men and women, tho it might AMUSE US, like we amuse children because of their ignorance. But, the idea of us being angels hereafter, should not be held up as such before children as a Truth, since, every Error planted in the Conscience of a child must later be uprooted in order to make room for the

Truth as it really is, as, "man shall give account of every idle word." We, who are older should learn a lesson by experience, or, that it is very difficult to drop an Error or anything engrafted in us from childhood, so as not to burden the child with the same experience we have undergone, for, "because the father is a republican, the child will be one also." The Priest said "Give me a child until it is twelve years old, then you can have it the balance of the time." He knew full well what it means in the support of any doctrine. It would be much better if children, like older persons, were allowed more freedom on such things, that they might be led more by Truth than by us. We ought not to complain if the child tells us a falsehood, when the parents implant THE FIRST LIE by telling them "there is a Santa Claus." But, this is a good illustration of how we have been and are children, and to amuse us as we amuse children by telling of a Santa Claus, we have accepted a LIE for the Truth concerning the real life of man and his future. But like the children who shall not always remain a child and in ignorance, we too, shall not always remain the child of ignorance. I believe as Rousseau says in his book of "Emile," —"Let the child take nothing for granted because some one says it is so. Nothing is good to him but what he feels to be good. You think it far sighted to push him beyond his understanding of things, but you are mistaken. For the sake of arming him with weapons he does not know how to use, you take from him one universal among men, common sense; you teach him to allow himself always to be let, never to be more than a machine

in the hands of others. You are continually saying to him, 'All I require of you is for your own good, but you cannot understand it yet. What does it matter to me whether you do what I require or not? You are doing it entirely for your own sake.' With fine speeches you are paving the way for some kind of a trickster or fool,—some visionary babbler or charlatan—who will entrap him or persuade him to adopt his own folly." How truly these words bring to bear on the present day characteristics. We have criminals grown and not "born" so, as the general opinion that criminality is necessarily hereditary. I can in my observation name many "unfits" who are so because they were "let" by their parents and then subject to be let to others' influence. We see thousands holding positions to-day who are failures in the same because they were "let" to their parents. (i.e.) The parents will say to the child, "When you grow up I want you to be so and so—a doctor, a lawyer, etc." It matters not whether you are capable of being so, but "I think for you, and because I am your senior, I ought to know what is good for you, because you are too young to understand it." So, the child is not able to develop in it the faculties it should develop, but must try to develop in it the faculties which are in others, and that is impossible, but the parents see in the child only that which is good for the child—seemingly so, and the child adopts something that is unfit for its own talent, and finally, when it fails to make good in something it was never intended to be so by natural development, it becomes careless, and takes up anything suggested, and that

often chances to be something along the line of criminology, because failures in everything generally lead to criminal acts as a last step. This reminds me of a case where the father was a shoemaker—a German who having sent his child to school with the intention of making not only a shoemaker out of his son, also wished him to take up certain studies to adapt himself to the business. The child did not seem to take to these studies, but during the hours of lesson would spend most of his time in drawing pictures on his slate. It happened one day he was drawing pictures, that the teacher chanced to see his slate, and thereon he had made the picture of his teacher. For this he received a sound flogging from his parent, as well as from his teacher. But this did not seem to change the child's views, tho many times after this, he was flogged for the same purpose of making pictures instead of taking up the lessons chosen by his father. He soon became tired of this and leaving school, ran away from home. When away from home and under his own guidance he soon took up painting, and he is to-day one of the best artists in Germany. So, let the child alone, that the Truth as to its future life in Religion and trade may develop, instead of the one you wish it to develop, while perhaps, in yourself, you have made a great failure. Your religious views have brought you failure too, since it is not in keeping with a more progressive growth and understanding that comes thru experience, rather than thru belief alone built upon theory. Many people are expecting to see Jesus "appear" again, but this blindness of waiting will never open the door to his coming.

"This is life Eternal to know God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent," and not according to the general opinion "will be life eternal." If man looks at what "IS LIFE ETERNAL," which IS THOUGHT, instead of Material for motion or organic life merely,—he is enlightened to the fact that the actual Truth about his existence IS HERE, or to be experienced here, rather than to be lived in an uncertain locality. Jesus said, "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and live, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life,—and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." You will note here also that "the resurrection" refers to "damnation," and not to "the resurrection" of what you would like to call it, and that it does not refer to you or any individual as coming "forth," to be resurrected from this life to another life hereafter. So, "the resurrection," as the Knowledge of a thing, which thing is here referred to as that of the True Life of man, for, to have the true Knowledge of life is to have "the resurrection" of life, which Knowledge will bring "forth" the Truth concerning Eternal Life, while, to have the wrong Knowledge of life, is to have "the resurrection of damnation," because it will bring "forth" the Error concerning Eternal Life—both resurrection bringing forth its kind. The above statement has given some the idea that "graves" refers to where people are buried, which, of course, is true in the case where people are buried, but this is not THE DEATH of people, ("God is not the God of the dead, but

of the living"), but the death of what constitutes life as to Truth and Error being buried, so "the graves" signifies the Conscience of man, or men because more than one grave is mentioned, and the Thoughts therein are "THEY WHICH SHALL COME FORTH." It was said by Jesus that "they might have life MORE abundantly," which approves the idea that one can take on as much as they are able to understand, and disapproves the idea that man is under a death sentence NOW, but will receive Eternal Life hereafter, for, "they that never perish," are "my words for they are spirit and they are life." Jesus said, "I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture." That is, Man and the Idea shall be "saved" from Evil, because, thru this "door" of understanding that God is "everywhere present" as the words "go in and out and find pasture" thus signify, he shall not be and cannot always be controlled by Evil.

It says in Matthew 25: 35, "For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty and ye gave me drink,—I was a stranger and ye took me in." Jesus refers to the Idea of Life, or Christ that was "a stranger," which stranger in the form of Jesus was "hungered" to be received by the people, and by accepting him as the teacher, "gave me meat," because, to feed upon this Truth would nourish the "word," that it would live. This is the Truth that "shall hunger no more" as spoken of in Revelation when man upholds—manifests the Truth—God only. So, they that will uphold—feed on this Truth shall give Him—Truth—

"Meat," because the result of feeding—upholding the Truth before the people will increase the Truth and lessen Error. The Christ Idea is and has been "a stranger" according to the past and present idea, but, in "the day of judgment," or when a better understanding is visible, ("The veil is taken away"). "Ye took me in."

We will now turn our attention more to "the fast," which is an important step in the right direction towards bringing out what it really means toward the Truth. I find some men have made "fools" of themselves, by abstaining from food for "forty days" and others believe that the "flesh" of animals should not be taken. It seems that most anything is allowed in Religion, in order to avoid the Truth in that it would convict itself if it preached the true "fast" and did not live it. Meat and food and pleasure in games and amusements are not the things to abstain from, or to which "the fast" refers. Sexual indulgence is "the flesh" to abstain from, because it is the one thing contrary to Spiritual growth, and is "the flesh that lusteth against the Spirit." We hear on every side—"it is according to nature, and why not indulge and even freely in it?" Granting that it is according to nature, we may have stepped beyond the laws of nature. The law of nature is to multiply, and if this were only used for that purpose, the result would be a healthy generation. Neither does the fast allude to any specified time, or "forty days." This "forty days" refers to that part of the individual life of Jesus, and not man in general, or that man is to set apart so many days in which to fast. By secluding him-

self from the world—presence of such worldly company and environments that would tend to bring forth an Evil desire, Jesus was able to grow in strength thru the Higher Thought which he became more Conscious of by looking up to such a Principle of Life. This also was his desire because he had passed thru an ordeal ("it is hard to go against Conscience") that he could not live to reach a more peaceful life—so he became Conscious of this desire—therefore, to "pray and fast"—a desire to abstain from this "flesh"—sexual indulgence for "forty days" gave him strength to meet the desire when it came up before him as is illustrated by his remark,—"get thee behind me Satan." Jesus could, after this fast, go forth in the world and be present with the sex, and not be "tempted" as heretofore he was tempted and yielded, for, he was like unto us and all men. He here proved how man is to be "BORN AGAIN," tho "born of the flesh," for, after this fasting he was able to say to man,—"In the world ye shall have tribulation, but be of good cheer, for I have overcome the world." It is absurd, as the general opinion that Jesus "overcome the world" for YOU, but that you should "be of good cheer" to know how HE overcame the world. This was because of praying and fasting—desiring to and abstaining from the flesh, and such a remark is in keeping with Paul's remark, "I wish all men were even as I am." This "all men" signifies when the Natural condition shall finally be overcome, which will THEN BE "The end of the world." Paul says, "I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I."

"But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn." In speaking with a friend on this subject he said,—"If all people held the same view as you believe, what would become of the world?" I replied,—"The world existed thousands of years before you or man lived, therefore, what need I to worry over what shall become of the world? besides, it is not to be considered that in this generation there will be any great change along this line of Reformation. What the result will be "no man knoweth, not even the Son," so why should one aiming to live according to the teaching and Truth taught by Jesus care what the result shall be, since, "I CAN OF MYSELF DO NOTHING," and only subject to what I believe and live to-day. You have often come in contact with persons who have held the view that if it were not for what they did in life, there would be no help for others, or the world could not exist; and so they think if they leave a position in life, or a job of work, say,—"What will become of the position or job if I cease to be the whole thing." But we find when they are gone and out, that even a more competent person is ready to fill the position. Do not "worry" about the good old world, for it will Progress and move along without the helpmate of such men, since, they are but utterances of things which amount to nothing more than themselves in conceit, which are not needed along the line of growth, and Progress. So, after the fast, Jesus was able to say "get thee behind me Satan," and this "exceeding high mountain" to which it refers in the same chapter is significant of the HEIGHT of

understanding Jesus had of both—Good and Evil, and the Power of the One to save man—the form from the other. Mr. Franz Molnar in his play called "The Devil," illustrates the above in the same manner by depicting "The Devil" working in the Conscience, for, when pointing to the head of Karl Mahler, the artist in the play, and Olga Hofman, the banker's wife, he says, "I am here." When the disciples referred to one they were unable to heal, Jesus said "this kind goeth not out but by praying and fasting." To-day we find many who have over-indulged and "abused" the laws of nature, and have reached such a state as is illustrated in the above, and the only help is desiring and abstaining—"Praying and fasting"—from this indulgence until the body is healed accordingly, tho sometimes it is too late, and THEN IS "THE SOUL AND BODY IN HELL." So the "forty days" of fasting—abstaining from the sexual indulgence and its influence, is simply to illustrate how one is to go about to prove the Power can be strengthened in the Conscience by "praying to"—desiring to live the Higher—Heaven conception of Life. It is absurd to even think that Jesus was "the Son of God" and then think that he should be expected to "fast," or there would be no Reason to the idea that he should fast, if he or any individual was and is the Son of God. He was the Son of God in the Sense that he Manifested the Truth CONCERNING the Higher Life, or when he did not Manifest the opposite or Lower Life as he did before "the fast," and as he even expressed a desire to live the Natural Life after the fast while in company with Mary Magdalene.

However, he may at times have given up to this desire of "the flesh," as he had done heretofore, yet, in order to strengthen his idea with the people of what shall be the future life for man as he was able by "the fast" to prove it could be lived when the Thought had become Absolute, so "the lie" was necessary in order to strengthen the Truth. In referring to the same Truth, it was not until the after years of Paul's life that he said "I wish all men were even as I am." But Paul was more considerate and truthful about his private life than Jesus, when he said, "For if the Truth of God hath more abounded thru MY LIE unto his glory, why yet am I also judged as a sinner? So then, it is NO FAST AT ALL, nor a "sacrifice," to abstain from one kind of food and amusement, because, IT IS VERY EASY TO GIVE UP one or two kinds of food and amusement, and THEN SIMPLY SUBSTITUTE OTHER FOOD and amusements. Such hypocrisy WILL NEVER RENDER VIRTUE its just dues. To abstain from Sexual indulgence is a REAL "FAST," and a REAL "SACRIFICE," because there is no other so-called pleasure—flesh—to fill its place in the world, and such is "THE FLESH WHICH LUSTETH AGAINST THE SPIRIT" of Good—God. Paul says in substance, "Meat commendeth us not to God; for neither, if we eat, are we the better; neither if we eat not are we the worse." Jesus said "How is it that ye do not understand, that I spake not concerning bread"—food or flesh of any kind,—"that ye should beware of the Pharisees, and the Sadducees? "Then understood they how that he bade them NOT beware of the

leaven of bread,—but of the DOCTRINE of the Pharisees, and of the Sadducees," because such a "belief" of abstaining from food or flesh as a "Doctrine" of the Truth would not destroy "the flesh" but really hinder the Truth as "the Christ," or Idea of Life to be HERE LIVED. "In the world ye shall have trouble" which is caused by living "after the flesh"—sexual, and not flesh—meat or food of any kind,—according to two of the greatest teachers, and as illustrated by Meredith when he wrote: "we can live without love, what is passion but pining, but where is the man that can live without dining." Jesus understood then as did Paul that it would not be practical to dwell much on such a subject too deep for the "natural man" as Paul said,—"The natural man knoweth not the things that be of God, for they are FOOLISHNESS unto him, neither can he KNOW THEM, for they are Spiritually discerned." (i.e.) The Physical student and man working along physical lines, knoweth not the things that be of Thought, for it is Mentally discerned, and so naturally lived instead of Spiritually so. "The meat that perisheth not," is the Spiritual Word—Christ, as Jesus says when referring to this Truth,—"I am the bread of life." This IS and HAS Life, because it IS Life, and is the meat—"food from heaven," because it is the Highest conception of Life. The followers of Moses "received bread," a kind of Truth, but was not the real Truth, since, it was from "The DESERT" —POOR UNDERSTANDING that Moses had of God, and is not "the true bread from heaven," for, to-day when Moses is read, "the veil" of misunderstanding is visible,

"WHICH VEIL"—BLINDNESS is taken away in Christ." It says in John 6: 32, 33 and 35,—"Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, Verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven, but my Father—Thought—giveth you the true bread from heaven. "For the bread of God—Thought—is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. "And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger: and he that believeth in me shall never thirst." Jesus did not refer to himself—the individual, as "the bread of life," but that the Infinite Principle of Thought—"Father" is the "bread"—Life which cometh down from heaven—the highest conception of life. In the above sentence, Christ—the Eternal Idea of life is the ONE Jesus referred to as the "Word," and called Jesus Christ because the Word—Christ was associated with Jesus. So, "I am the bread of life"—inasmuch as "I live" the Christ life as Paul says, "I live, yet, not I, but Christ liveth in me." Jesus wished to be excused from living after the Christ or Idea as is illustrated by this remark,—"if it were possible let this cup fall from me." Then he again became Conscious of the fact that he should continue in his present state of life, and finished by saying, "Not my will but thine be done." There are then two wills; one is "of the flesh," and the other is "of the Spirit." This "will be done" reminds me of the nonsensical remark of our former president, placing his assassination as being connected with the work and hand of a God, when he said "God's will be done." And it has been and is the same murderous idea

held by those who preach the ignorant doctrine of what God is, and so, kill and destroy each other and things, and EXCUSE THEMSELVES by saying "it is the will of God," or, "God is with us in war."

In John 11: 1, 4, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, it reads,—"Now a certain MAN was sick, NAMED Lazarus, of Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha. When Jesus heard THAT, he said, this sickness is NOT UNTO DEATH, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby. "When he had heard therefore that he was sick, he abode two days still in the same place where he was. "These things said he: and after that he said unto them, Our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go, that I may awake him out of sleep. "Then said his disciples, Lord, if he sleep he shall do well. "Howbeit, Jesus spake of death,—but they thought that he had spoken of taking of rest in sleep. "Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead. "And I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe: nevertheless let us go unto him." You will note the *italics* used in "man" and "named," which illustrates the idea that this *man named* Lazarus is distinct from the Son—Truth to be "glorified"—elevated, and that MAN NAMED is that which is subject to death and decay, yet, Lazarus as I shall aim to prove was not in such a condition of sickness, death and decay, but APPEARED SO to the people. Jesus here "raised" MAN'S opinion—"Lazarus"—from "the dead" principles of life to that of the True and Living Principles of Life thru this form of Lazarus, so

that the Truth concerning God might be RAISED, and thereby glorified—elevated and worshipped, by man rather than "the dead" principles and ceremonies generally taught. The resurrection—Knowledge of the dead—Truth as you ought to perceive by the verses written here was not to follow at some future time as they and we have even held to this day in regard to us. Why did Jesus claim that Lazarus was "asleep," and then change his plea to that of "death?" They, like we, supposed this sleep or death—hypnotic state—was really death, and therefore said "he shall do well," and so is dead—the Word is dead—to the generation of believers in death, as he said finally when the word "sleep" did not have its effect,—"Lazarus is dead." The idea that man shall die or sleep until a certain time and then awake—rise—is a false statement, and shows as it illustrates here the ignorance of the Power of Thought in the Mental Or Spiritual over the Physical or Natural, and to save man from destruction HERE. Jesus said "Lazarus is dead," that they who "believed" the "old doctrine" of "the dead" being "resurrected," should SEE MAN ARISE NOW FROM THE DEAD, in proportion as he is able to receive—be conscious of the Truth of Spiritual Life NOW. This APPEARED "miracle," for there is no miracle in the Knowledge of Truth, was performed for the purpose of showing man that he should experience this life now as much as possible, else there would be no reason to the argument of raising "Lazarus" from the dead—principles of death as it is illustrated here. Miracles only have their life in the "superstitious minds"

which are always more discernible in the more natural persons. Continuing in John 11: 21, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27, we read,—"Then said Martha unto Jesus, Lord, If thou hadst been here, my brother had not died. Jesus saith unto her, thy brother shall rise again. Jesus saith unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life, he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this? She saith unto him, yea, Lord: I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world." Martha said, "I KNOW that he shall rise again in the resurrection," but Jesus contradicts this, and OUR knowing—"believing"—by saying, "I am the resurrection and the life." "He that believeth and liveth in me shall never die," is analogous to the fact that you must not only "BELIEVE," but must "LIVE" the life he taught, but, as we have unknown the known and so cannot live or, "liveth" it fully, we cannot expect to experience it Wholly, or, "never die." Jesus said in regard to this misused and abused word "believe,"—"If thou say to this mountain, be thou removed and believe it can be done, it shall be removed." But we have not found the person who is so foolish as to believe such, tho it illustrates what a Power belief has to do with the life of man, tho we know the mountain cannot be moved because we cannot believe it, yet, it could be moved if you could believe it. The quotation illustrates how foolish it was for Martha or any one to believe impossibilities, or that a dead body could be made to come to life, yet, if you could believe it, in experience,

it would be such by experience. Spencer truly says, "we know nothing more of existence than a continued manifestation," because there is no other existence than what is known as life in the Visible. So we have all been as blind as Martha, as to "the resurrection" of that which cannot be resurrected. This Idea could not exist "since the foundation of the world" because the Thought of Good and Evil had not developed to its true height of understanding until the time of Jesus. "Though he were dead, yet shall he live," was a direct remark to Martha THEN, and therefore illustrates that it cannot refer to an after life, nor to a continued life to the then and now individual, but refers to the Truth or Dead that shall live by this Knowledge given to man. Paul illustrates this in his remark,—"I die daily,"—that is, he put off each day as much as possible the Natural condition by living the Spiritual Truth as a condition THEN, as it is now by you and I as the Truth works in us as it did in Jesus, "This is" and now is, "The Resurrection"—Knowledge. Note the final answer given by Martha to the question put to her by Jesus,—"I believe that thou art the Christ," which is not an ANSWER AT ALL, but really EVADES THE QUESTION, and so illustrates ignorance of what he was talking about.

There is no doubt but that Jesus did feel in a way, that he would be saved from death, and why not? Since, nearly these two thousand years have we believed the same thing, and Jesus was no exception to the average believer when he gave some thought of himself, which is selfish, and can only be related to the material. No doubt he thought

he was "the Son of God" as an individual, because he did not understand the exact meaning of Power in the term that it could be applied to a person in the form of mesmerism, hypnotism, etc., and so believed this Power was from a Being, and that he—because he was able to use it had formed the opinion that he was the Son of this Being, tho he had a right to believe he was the individual Expression of what can be termed God, in that no form of life exists but what is in a form of unity, whether it be material or spiritual. If to some extent he and man had not believed and feared, where would we—man—have been to-day? This of course is proof here, that in an ignorant generation it is folly to be wise, or that ignorance and knowledge cannot associate with each other without being antagonistic. We have been taught to fear, and so fear has withheld us and Progress, and because of this we have also suffered and will suffer in all walks of life because of fear. But to-day we are learning thru a better understanding the meaning of fear, or, that "fear hath torment, and fear killeth," also, "he that feareth is not made perfect in love." We are learning not to fear God, nor anything Good, but rather to destroy anything contrary to Good, by recognizing it as the only Eternal Principle of life. It is because some have feared and believed, that they have been free from violence to others, which is the one thing Religion has done and is doing, and should receive some credit in keeping such a class from violence, yet, it is not the true way in which to overcome or to destroy violence. We have wars and kill with the "belief" that it will right a wrong, which is not

Scientific, because that is returning "evil for evil." It is a wrong against another wrong, since neither may be right. We are beginning to understand that man should be educated to "love one another," and not to hate one another as in war. So, I term there are two classes working,—one, a religious class calling themselves Christians, who, apparently do no wrong because of a fear of some God,—the other, a class called Infidels by Christians, (but only Infidels in name, as those are Christians in name only who call themselves Christians), who do no wrong apparently because of a Conscious State having developed to that State of Consciousness which hinders them from doing an evil act, because they realize the punishment and suffering must follow here in some form or other, and I argue that such belong to a more Scientific generation, because they know what life is thru experience and observation. The so-called Christians will fall into this class as soon as they have received the same Knowledge, and will be more truly Christians, since, they will do nothing wrong when they have no excuse to be forgiven, which will result in ending Evil much sooner than to believe an evil can be committed and then forgiven. So, we can readily see why Jesus could entertain some "hope" for the future, even, if he did not look to the future as some of his followers are doing, or rather, those who are claiming to follow him.

In order to prove my previous and present statement that Jesus was not "the Son of God," and an opportunity for the former opinion of Jesus that if he had believed he was the Son of God it

was here completely "knocked out," I need only to mention his LAST WORDS: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" This is a remark wholly and absolutely uncalled for, if he could THEN on the cross realize that he was really "the Son of God," other than the Representative of the Word—Christ—while in life he lived the Truth according to the Spiritual Idea. Here too, in the face of the fact that he had been so sincere in his teachings, and wished his disciples to follow and believe what he had said, should not have uttered such a remark in their presence. But it was more than a mortal, or any one working under such trials could bear, and so the words came forth thru volition from the shock received. These last words illustrate his mistake during life in looking for any future for him and man generally, while Paul's remark is more in keeping with mortals: "Ye are as sheep for the slaughter." Jesus had no chance to change here and give a different opinion to the people when he had, at the last moment, found his belief for himself had been shattered as is expressed by the words spoken, since, there was no God—Thought to save man, or to work with man after death—"God is not the God of the Dead." What boy is there, who, having accomplished all in the world that his father desired, never tiring of his work, knowing and having faith that the father would not forsake him in the last moment, would then say "father, why hast thou forsaken me?" Besides, where is the father that would forsake his son who had done all in the world that was asked of him? You and I would have little use for such a father,

nor would you and I treat a son in that fashion, that he would have occasion to seek us in such a pitiful way as is expressed in these last seven words of Jesus. If God performed thru Jesus, all the so-called miracles as a Being instead of the Thought as Power, why not answer the people who said, "if he come down now, we will believe him," or "save yourself," and that will give us proof. It was just as reasonable for him to "come down" then, as to claim later by a few that he did "rise from the grave,"—in fact, it would have been more reasonable and no chance for a doubt, and he could then have made his disappearance. We must have proofs in order to entertain facts, because we cannot get any understanding without proof. The principle of mathematics furnishes us with a Rule whereby we can PROVE THE ANSWER. So likewise, must we have the answer to the question,—"save yourself" by proving it is so by saving yourself from death, and not that we should listen to a few who had got "together," and if not having been influenced in their own minds, in the form of mesmerism as to seeing Jesus, they here formed a plan by which they could deceive the people in order that the teaching would be believed as to what constitutes a future life. To "come down" would have been a GENUINE MIRACLE, and not a case of deception, or, as Paul said "the Truth will abound more by MY LIE," because it seems well in an ignorant and superstitious generation to "give the lie." We have a beautiful illustration of the dead, or the Spiritual and Natural Idea, in the "Prodigal Son" as given in Luke 15: 24, saying,—"For this

my son was dead and is alive again." The "Son" here was not "dead," but was dead to the father, so long as absent from the father. So Jesus was not dead to the Father—Thought when he expressed the Spiritual Idea only, and was THEN "present with the Father," but he could not associate himself with God when he said "let this cup pass from me," because that expresses the Natural desire to live the Natural—flesh life. ("For this my Son was dead.")

I trust I am making this distinction of life and death clear to you as to what was resurrected, instead of the idea that Lazarus was really resurrected. So, "Jesus saith unto her, said I not unto thee, that, if thou wouldst believe, thou should see the glory of God!" Let us here turn again to what Jesus says in Matthew 22: 31 and 32. "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." In other words, God—Thought works thruout all generations as this verse illustrates three generations, or, He is God—Thought and work of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the form of a continued existence of Life. Jesus did not raise Lazarus from any death, for he had as much to do with the death—sleep—hypnotic state of Lazarus, as he did with the awakening—coming forth from "sleep." That Jesus regretted to make this deception or "my lie" in order to glorify God—elevate the Thought—is illustrated in John 11: 41 and 42. "Then they took away the stone from

the place where the dead laid. And Jesus lifted up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. "And I knew that thou hearest me always but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." You will remember by the remark made heretofore that Jesus first remarked to his disciples that Lazarus was "NOT DEAD BUT SLEEPETH," in order to try their faith in him or his teaching, but on perceiving their lack of faith and understanding and unbelief he then followed by saying "Lazarus is dead." If they had believed thru the first remark—"not dead but sleepeth," then Jesus would have gone immediately to the home of Lazarus where he lay in sleep—"sickness unto death," for you will note after he heard of the sickness of Lazarus that "he abode TWO DAYS in the SAME PLACE where he was." This gave Jesus an opportunity to work on Lazarus as a subject, or to bring him under the Hypnotic state while in the form of sickness he had power to do so. To bring Lazarus out from under the influence of sickness would not convince the people that he—Jesus was the Example of Truth, since he had done this many times to other persons, and still, they believed him not, and here was an opportunity to go a step farther as a "LIE" to aid the Truth. There is a regret in the remark of Jesus—"But because the people stand by I said it," and did it, for, as God is not one that "sees" and "hears" and "says," only in appearance to an ignorant generation, so this remark illustrates an error made, and the wish afterwards to be relieved in Conscience, as the error—deception—miracle—

was made in good faith. We can conclude here, that he had control, so to speak, over Lazarus and his friends after being in company with them so many times, and because they acknowledged him as a superior person. We know to-day that in many cases where a person has been hypnotized by another, that that person can be hypnotized by that person against the will of that person and at a distance. However, Jesus was evidently ignorant of this Power as Hypnosis in the form of transmission of Thought, and so believed it the work of a God or Being working thru him, since, he knew Lazarus was not in a state of death and decay. It is impossible to change the Reality of anything, or to get life out of a dead form. If you believe that Jesus believed in a God as a Being, and that he was a Son of this Being, instead of working as I have defined as Thought in the form of Being, and then the Son of such,—you have only to lay aside the selfish view of Jesus in order to bring about the true conception as I here define as Thought, since, we are to take Jesus at his word in "taking no thought what ye shall say"—meaning that when we take thought of our remarks they are selfish, or are of a selfish nature. So the remarks that are not selfish and made by Jesus are those remarks we are to define only, else we become contradictory in definition.

In John 12: 34, it reads,—"The people answered him. We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth forever; and how sayest thou, The son of man must be lifted up? who is this son of man?" In John 14: 20, it says "At that day ye shall know that I AM in my Father, and ye in me, and I

in you." They heard it right, that Christ "abideth forever," and the "son of man" to be "lifted up" is when man born of the flesh shall hear this "Word" which was "made flesh and dwelt among us" is "the Christ," and man shall live accordingly. The remark made elsewhere in the Bible that "Ye shall dwell with him," if taken figuratively, or in a Natural—selfish view, or separate person and form of existence would seem probable as a future habitation for man, but now we read in the above that "I am IN my Father, and ye in me," which contradicts the idea of the form of Jesus and man and God living together in a locality, and therefore evident that the DWELLING IN, or, "to dwell with him," refers to a Conscious State. "At that day" man shall know, is a remark addressed to ALL and KNOWING generations, and we can to-day get a glimpse of "THAT DAY," because this is the generation of a better understanding of what the words or parables in the Bible refer to, as this is "The day of judgment," therefore the "SECOND COMING." Jesus could not be any "part" with "the last day," yet, the "part" he did have in "the resurrection" or "the last day," was the knowledge and therefore the Expression of the Christ in HIS DAY.

To give a more detailed account of "the Christ" as the Idea and Principle of Life as it works to the Eternal end of things, I will refer to Paul in Cor. 15: 16 to 24th verse. "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised." That is, if the Christ or Idea of Spiritual Life is not "raised"—above the Jesus or Adam Idea of Natural Life in your Conscience, then the mortal belief cannot

be destroyed, so that man may rise above the Natural conditions, and therefore are they dead, or "rise not." "And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins," (i.e.) no faith and belief but the Christ Idea can raise man above the Natural, for we are proving to-day that faith in the Natural things and Thought of the same, or in sin—sin only because it—the Natural hinders the Spiritual growth, which "faith is vain." "Then they also which have fallen asleep in Christ are perished," (i.e.) they, the Natural Thoughts "are perished," because the Truth is affirmed, and because of this have "fallen asleep in Christ"—destroyed by the Christ as the Idea of Life. "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men, most miserable." (i.e.) if we have hope "ONLY" in "THIS LIFE" of a Christ Life HEREAFTER, we are "most miserable in "THIS LIFE," since, there is no other way by which the evils and diseased conditions may be abolished, because medicine is fast failing to relieve mind and body, therefore, have hope in Christ NOW. "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept," (i.e.,) Christ or the Word has been dead, owing to the lack of Knowledge being developed in the Conscience of man, or the belief that "the Christ" is to appear in a form as Jesus, and so "NOW IS Christ risen from the dead," thru a correct understanding—judgment of the Truth taught by Jesus, therefore, "the first fruits of them that slept," is a result of this awakening. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead," (i.e.) by man living under the Adam or Idea of

Natural life, tho impossible to do otherwise because of the Natural Law; the Word was "dead"—not understood—but thru the Evolution of Thought and understanding is the Word or Christ alive—understood, also signifying that these conditions are developed or evolved and embodied by man as the generations pass, as it says: "by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead"—the Knowledge of the meaning of the dead as not referring to man directly, but to the Truths of Spiritual Life as a Thought—God to abolish the Principle of the Natural condition,—"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ, shall all be made alive," (i.e.) all who look to the Natural Idea of Life here, and a Spiritual Life hereafter, are under the Adamic Law of life and death; while those who look to the Spiritual Idea as a Life to be lived here will assist—"have part" in bringing about the Truth, "But every man in his own order, Christ the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." (i.e.) All may TAKE PART, or PARTAKE OF "THIS LIFE" HERE, but, ONE GENERATION AFTER ANOTHER SHALL DECLARE IT, that is, "MAN IN HIS OWN ORDER," "Christ the first fruits" is significant of the present generation, when the Spiritual —Christ as the Idea is affirmed during the Natural existence, while, "they that are Christ's at his coming," signifies THE END OF THE NATURAL CONDITION, since, it cannot come, or be present WHOLLY, or exist ALONE as ONE Idea, where there are Thoughts of a Natural life and condition. The word "CHRIST'S" is significant of "ALL MEN EVEN AS I AM," or as all men having

the ONE IDEA—CHRIST, therefore are they "CHRIST'S." So then, Nature, as Emerson says, "works to its own end," while as Paul says Thought or "God worketh in you" to its own end.

Jesus never referred to the Natural, or an earthly father and mother after he became Conscious of this knowledge of the Spiritual Law, because there could be no mother and father to it as that of Personal, since it was and is an Idea that can only be fathered and mothered as Thought. Mrs. Eddy says "there is no record of Jesus calling any man on the earth "father;" which would impress one with the idea of a record being in existence where he called a woman "mother." There exists no record of either in the Bible, because such would impress the idea that "the Christ" is born of man and woman, when, only Jesus as all men and women are born thru the process of Natural Law, tho we may have OPINIONS as Mrs. Eddy has of the birth of Jesus, or that he was "born of God and Mary." I will quote that part of a chapter where it speaks of "mother," when Jesus is addressed by his disciples in regard to his mother, which may be taken by some and Mrs. Eddy that he called her mother. When the disciples said to him: "Thy mother is standing without, desiring to speak with you," Jesus replied: "Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand *toward his disciples* and *said:* Behold *my mother and my brethren.*" The *italics* are mine, so as to impress the idea made in regard to what he looked at as "mother." Here he ignored the facts of a Natural existence, or father and mother, not but

what he knew and believed in such an existence, but only, in order to "HOLD FAST to that which is Good—God, or an Eternal existence of Thought as a Unity, as will be seen by his looking "TOWARD HIS DISCIPLES," instead of toward his mother. He said, "For whosoever shall do the will of my Father"—Thought—"which is in heaven"—which is the Highest conception of life —"the same is my brother and sister and mother." This signifies that "Father" is Thought, and should be expressed the same by all in the form of a Unity. "Brother and sister and mother" HERE indicate this, and that the disciples should receive and live and give it out to the world as such—be a mother to it. Also, in verse 26 of the same chapter, his mother is not referred to as HIS MOTHER where he says to his mother, "Behold thy son," but that she should receive THAT DISCIPLE as a son; for, in the 27th verse following he turns likewise to this disciple and says "Behold thy mother." We find here, that, tho Jesus had been with the disciples a great length of time, yet, they knew not "Christ," as he aimed here to picture the Idea, while they looked on him from a personal view, and therefore, could not understand the meaning Jesus put forth regarding his looking away from his mother. In John 20: 9, it says, "For as yet they knew not the Scriptures that he must rise again." The latter part of the verse—"He must rise again from the dead"—is significant that "the Christ" as the Spiritual Idea of life would appear "again" at a later period, "in the day of judgment"—the day when a better understanding of what Jesus re-

ferred to when talking to the disciples when he looked away from "his mother," since, we have not known Christ.

In John 20: 11, 12, 13 and 14 it says: "But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping,—and as she wept, she stooped down, *and looked* into the sepulchre, And seeth two angels in white, sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain. And they say unto her. Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him. And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus."

We cannot say with accuracy where and how the body of Jesus was moved and placed, but we DO KNOW IT WAS NECESSARY TO REMOVE IT, and by his few followers, in order to "FULFIL THE SCRIPTURES," or that the Truth may be more universally "believed" in an ignorant generation, tho it is not necessarily the Truth because it is "believed" as such, yet, a "lie" is a help to the Truth in an ignorant generation. While Mary "stood without and weeping," the normal state of consciousness was replaced by a mesmeric state which was due to her absorbed thought of seeing Jesus, and therefore brought about the Visionary Result, or, "she saw the Lord." But we perceive that when she came back to her normal condition, that "the Lord was not there." This weeping and over-anxious thought for him, brought on a kind of nervous condition wherein she could easily be influenced in her own conscience by suggestive

thought of things not realities in form as really existing. It says: "Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not: for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and to your God." Here it is plain that Mary could not reach a state of solidity in such a state of consciousness as to the Perfect state of man existing in real life, and for this reason a thought suggested that she could not "touch" him, since it could only be A VISION of the Truth in form, therefore, not the Reality of Form. It was not the voice of Jesus that she heard, but the same ECHO that Spiritualists seem to hear from the "departed"—dead. It appeared to her as such, because she saw the vision of a form, or an illusion, therefore her own thoughts seemed to come from that source, which thoughts could easily be formed while in such a state, since the opposite view brings about a different state of thought. Mary had and could not ascend to that realm of consciousness which Jesus had taught, while living in the deceptive state, therefore she could not "ascend to the Father" as is illustrated by these words seemingly coming from Jesus, as he could not while in such a state as she believed. By the congregating "together" of the disciples, and their absorbed thought for Jesus, thru the teachings and their "belief" in seeing him; they were consequently more able to see the vision of him, and receive the thought of their own as coming from the vision, than the people who were not so interested and did not believe in spirits. The Word—Christ as taught by him must not be lost to sight, and for

this reason it was a good thing for the disciples and persons in general, and even we of to-day, that the disciples were "ASSEMBLED TOGETHER," thru what Mary said to the disciples concerning her "seeing;" which again brought about the vision of Jesus to them, and making the Truth appear more to them than thru his teaching alone. We, of to-day, may be thankful for what the disciples SEEMED TO SEE, else the whole spirit of the Letter—Word might have been lost. We ought to be thankful also, for what the insane persons SEEM TO SEE, and learn a lesson from such a sight, that we may not go to the extreme indulgences in the different forms of Evil, which causes them to SEE THINGS, tho the outside observer or "UNBELIEVER" knows it is not a Reality. In Matthew 17: 9, it says,—"And as they came down from the mountains, Jesus charged them, saying, tell the vision to no man until the Son of man be risen from the dead." The word "vision," according to the best authorities, is "a phantom or power of sight," therefore NOT A THING REALLY EXISTING, or a REALITY BEING PRESENT. But we can imagine and even believe that this "vision" or "sight" of Truth seen by the disciples is to illustrate that the Word—Christ as the Idea of Life will in time become a REALITY, or a Visible and Eternal existence, instead of the present Visible existence of the Real and Unreal Idea of Life—Christ and Adam—Spiritual and Physical—Mental and Natural. The disciples then, saw ONLY A VISION of what might become a Reality, according to the words of Jesus as stated in Matthew,

therefore not a Reality. The Word—Christ is at present True, but only VISIONARY, because it has been and is observed as a Vision, so, it is about time to ABOLISH THE VISIONARY IDEA AND TEACHING of a Spiritual Life in the future, that the "Vision" of Truth may become a present Possibility or a Reality. This state of mesmerism as referred to is nothing but another form of "trance," which we can imagine Paul was subject to, as we find others are to-day, and see and seem to see much that was and is not a Reality while in a state of trance as referred to in Acts 22: 17. "And it came to pass, that when I came again to Jerusalem, even while I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance."

Like all opinions which have builded their religions on chapters taken from some part of the Bible, it is here evident that Spiritualism received its initial step. They have as great a right in the "belief" of their views being correct, as other religions based upon some other chapters, that to my conception seem incorrectly interpreted. After making a thoro study of the scriptures, if it were possible to believe in such theories as the average religious belief, then, in this chapter where it speaks of "seeing" Jesus; I would not sentence such an interpretation and belief as is made by the Spiritualists who claim to have seen and talked with their departed friends, etc., in the form of Spirits, yet, all other religious followers, or those opposed to Spiritualism believe the disciples talked with Jesus. That the material—your body can be transformed, or come under the influence of a so-called spiritual body so they may converse with each other, and then separate, according to the

Spiritualistic code is impossible in any Scientific Sense or Science. There can be, as illustrated before, no such representatives of life as a Spiritual body and a Material body—two bodies—other than what exists in Thought and body by expression—two lives lived in the world by one person or body as associated and relatively to the immortality of the Soul, and mortality of the body, for there is "no other world" existence. So, the work of Spiritual Life is now and has been embodied by us and those gone before, and if it is unable to be worked out during that—this bodily existence—and proof is that it is not, it will continue to Evolve until Perfection is reached in the world by other existing bodies. The only reason then, for one person called Material, and being able to talk with another person CALLED (not so) Spiritual, is not because there is such, but because of a Mental state DUE TO SUCH A BELIEF, or as psychologists claim is due to "the sub-conscious mind." It is Sir Oliver Lodge who, having recently been recognized in England with his Spiritualistic doctrine, must have had in mind that he could also make the people of America wake up more to this belief, and so his "sub-conscious mind" created the idea as a thought coming from his Son when he claims "Raymond was pleased that I was going to America and thought (his father thought) I should do some good there." This is characteristic of materialism, since I find among my Spiritualist friends the same are given up much to materialism in that they indulge in such like. In other words, Spiritualism is not relatively Spiritual, nor does not by its teaching tend to elevate man toward living the Spiritual life, but tends to elevate

materialism. We find then, that the individual becomes conscious of a reply made out of his own thinking, and like other beliefs, the more one studies along these lines and beliefs, the more one is able to talk "with the departed," showing, one must be absorbed in the thought of being able to converse with subjects. If you believe Mr. Jones is in the "Spirit world" (no such place), Mr. Jones will reply from YOUR OWN BELIEF, and if he is happy, as YOU THINK HE OUGHT TO BE, then he—you—will reply that he is happy, from what you think, tho it may seem to come from some other place while you are under this state of mentality, which is "self mesmerism." Very similar, are the experiences of those not in such a position as Spiritualists. There are cases of, where what is termed "hallucinations" which appear to the living as real, of which I quote part of an article: "Hallucinations and the world beyond," written in "Hampton Columbian Magazines." "The Rev. G. Lyon Turner, professor of philosophy at the Lancashire Independent College, Manchester, England, woke up one morning to find the ceiling of his room adorned with a huge chandelier of some ten arms, and the jets shining brightly thru the ground-glass globes at the end of each arm. He knew that when he went to bed no chandelier had been there, and naturally feared that something was the matter with his eyesight. 'I moved my head,' he said, 'to see whether the phantom moved too.' But no, it remained fixed: and the objects and beyond it became more or less completely visible as I moved, exactly as would have been the case had it been a real chandelier. So I woke my wife, but she saw nothing.

"Still more bizarre was the phantasm that appeared to another Englishman. Here is his own account of it. 'I had just gone to bed, and was—at least, this was my impression at the time—quite awake. The door of my room was ajar, and there was a light in the passage which half-illumined my room. Suddenly I became aware of a series of slight taps on the passage outside. These taps were not sufficiently loud for a human footstep; on the other hand, the volume of sound was greater than that made by a walking-stick. I fully remember sitting up in bed and beholding two top boots trot rapidly across the room and vanish into the opposite wall. The illusion was astonishingly vivid, and I can recall the details to this day. I have never had a waking dream since."

"It sounds like a contradiction in terms to speak of ghosts of the living, but, as the census of hallucinations made evident, phantasms of persons still in the flesh, like phantasms of inanimate objects, are experienced fully as often, as phantasms of the dead. Obviously, in such cases there can be nothing objective about the apparitions. Yet to those who have seen them, phantasms of the living are quite as vividly realistic and make as profound an impression as phantasms of the dead, for which they are almost always mistaken, with consequent anguish to the persons whom they visit. To illustrate, Miss A. Cressy, while seated with her mother and sister in the dining-room of their English home, happened to glance up and saw, looking in at them thru an open window, a brother who was supposed to be in Australia. 'Oh, Mother,' she exclaimed, 'here's a surprise for us!

Tom has come home!' 'Tom home! Where is he?' 'Out on the lawn. I'll go and let him in.' She went to the front door and threw it open. No one was in sight. 'Tom!' she called. 'Where are you, Tom?' No answer. Then, thinking that in a jesting spirit he had hidden among the shrubbery: 'Come in, Tom. Don't play the fool. You know how weak your mother's heart is. Do you want to kill her?' Still silence. By this time her father had joined the little group at the front door, and all four made a rapid but thoro search of the grounds. No one was in them, nor could anyone have got away without being seen. Now, from the mother, came the wailing cry: 'It was not Tom you saw, but Tom's ghost. Tom is dead!' A year afterwards Tom came back from Australia in the best of health. Oddly enough, tho, it develops that, at the time his 'ghost' appeared to his sister, he had been seriously ill of a fever, and in his delirium had constantly entreated his attendants to place him under a great cedar that grew on his father's lawn."

This last case, while but a vision, can be traced as having its relation to "Telepathy" of which we are not in a position to define its Principle. We are here led to believe that "seen "and "talked with persons dead," is but a vision and so term it mesmerism, since it is a case of delusion in that it is not a reality of existence. We are more prone to accept these theories presented to us to-day, because we are living in a generation of higher tension, and many persons are more subject to the influence that may be brought before them by personalities who are looked up to as being their superior, yet,

these "leaders" may be weak on the same point. This is why so many persons at evangelistic meetings being led by a strong personality are made converts. Neither is it expected that you can mesmerize yourself into the Spiritual State while living in the material, and if you fail to accept the Christ Idea as the illustration is given in the Bible for that purpose,—then you are making no Progress towards a Spiritual Life here,—but, like the other, you too, are still mesmerized into believing you can see a Spiritual Life beyond, while you ignore the facts of Spirituality as a present possibility. Why did not Jesus appear to ALL PERSONS ALIKE, instead of just the few followers, if there was any such Truth that he could appear at all after death?

In order to give a more vivid impression of what I am aiming to prove is only temporal and visionary at times, I will quote a few remarks from the best authorities on the subject of Mesmerism, which follows with the same affirmation by the same writers that Mesmerism and Spiritualism are correlated in their phases.

"Those persons most readily susceptible to mesmeric influences generally prove to be the best mediums for spirit manifestation. That these phenomena in their higher phases—as those of trance, healing by touch, and subjection to the thought and will of another mind—are intimately allied with those of mesmerism, is obvious to all who have given any careful attention to them. Spiritualists, indeed, affirm that they differ only in this—that in the one case the operator is a mortal, in the other, a disembodied human spirit

possessing a Spiritual body, instead of a physical one."

After making a thoro study of the above remarks, and other experiences and observations along similar lines, I can only form one conclusion, —that Mesmerism and Spiritualism are one and the same thing. It would hardly be considerate for the Spiritualist to claim any real connection with mesmerism, since such an idea would remove the religious feeling, and thereby lessen the faith of its followers. If "those persons most readily susceptible to mesmeric influence generally prove to be the best mediums for spirit manifestation," it might be well to turn our attention to those persons SUBJECT to mesmerism.

"About 1774, Mesmer, a Viennese physician, commenced to treat diseased organs by the application of artificial magnets. The phenomena exhibited by his patients, especially the more nervous kind, led him to adopt the view that the magnets operated not as a SPECIAL source of influence, but as conductors of a magnetic fluid which he could communicate at will to the patient, even at a distance.

"In 1785, a Royal commission was appointed to examine Mesmer's pretentions. These investigators found that the same phenomena could be produced in Mesmer's more nervous patients when blindfolded, by merely inducing them to suppose themselves in the neighborhood of any of Mesmer's magnetic appliances, tho none were present; while conversely, magnets, and magnetic tree were alike powerless, if the patient were kept unaware of their proximity."

This sums up the problem that Mesmerism and Spiritualism are the same in action,—it being understood that by "inducing them to SUPPOSE themselves in the neighborhood of any of Mesmer's magnetic appliances" would produce the same result as if the "Medium" or "Mesmerizer" were present. The influence of the Mesmerizer Is "UNNECESSARY and in ALL CASES unimportant." It is necessary in Spiritualism and mesmerism to obtain the desired effect, for, by and thru the "Medium" and "Mesmerizer" the persons present can be induced to "suppose themselves" to be in communication with persons in the form of spirits, and the mesmerizer can make suggestions as to what is to be done by those under the spell of mesmerism, yet, neither have power over the other, since, it is the thought working in the Conscience of the persons present who are under the state of being present with other persons. It says the "more nervous persons"are the best "subjects" because they are more prone to suggestion. What is the result of the STILL "more nervous kind," but that condition called insanity? Under such mental conditions, no objects appear to the OUTSIDE OBSERVER, which SEEM REAL to their SIGHT OR VISION. Therefore, these or such like conditions that are prevalent to the insane, are subject to change, if that person returns to the normal state of Reason. If the insane ideas were true, the reality of their existence would APPEAR TO ALL ALIKE so the proof of their actuality would then remain fixed, or incessant. To-day, we have "healing" thru the practise of Spiritualism, Hypnotism,

Mental Science and Christian Science, all of which refer to some degree as to "Mind over Matter," tho the latter two claim "there is no matter." We find, therefore, the Truth of which Jesus taught IS to "overcome the world," instead of teaching, as Mrs. Eddy claims, "Man is Spiritual and not Material," which will never make him "overcome the world" here, any more than the other doctrines. I will agree that "I am" Spiritual and not Material. That is, "I am" is the same Idea—Christ—referred to when Jesus said "I am" not of the world, which is the same "ye are" not of the world, if the "I am" of you represents the same Idea—Christ—that Jesus Manifested. Here again, as I understand Christian Science, is why "by their fruits ye shall know them" is because by holding in Thought and Mind the Idea—Christ *is not and cannot be sick*, because it is not material, will, if not too late, respond by action on the material body, in that it elevates to that extent of healing Thru having greater Power over the Material. The faith in this does the healing, just as faith in the Doctor and his medicine does the healing, since medicine, as those Physicians with whom I have talked admit the fact that the medicine will not cure the disease. Some followers may say "It is not the fault of the teaching" because some have not advanced more than others, but I argue that any teaching is at fault if it cannot change its followers, because the followers cannot be at fault, since, they are only guided by what they are taught and believe. That is just the reason followers of any teaching are lacking, because somewhere, the teaching is lacking. Chris-

tian Science affirms that "man is perfect," as it claims "God is perfect" and that "WE" continue so, as a Spiritual Being, thereby, lessening the ability of the Thought or God to bring about such a state of Being Perfect HERE, as referred to by Jesus when he said, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect." This sentence simply illustrates that only thru the "heaven"—Highest conception of life can man become Perfect, and not that he is at present perfect, any more than God is Perfect, since, God—Thought cannot be Perfect in the visible (there is no Invisible Being) until the visible is Perfect, because nothing exists until it is visible, tho the idea may be Perfect in Principle, just as the Principle of Mathematics is Perfect, while mistakes can be made in an example. Then again; why use this parable in the Church, or "pray to be perfect," if it is to follow at some future time? So, it is time to abolish past beliefs, for, as it says, "the devil knoweth he hath but a short time to live," is significant of the fact that the present day Truth is having its effect on "the devil"—evil as it has been working "side by side" with Good. The Physical—"Devil" is working along all lines, such as "Sanitary Law," or that, to not heed the work of its followers, and live up to their principles will bring on disease. The foolhardy ideas of "open window schoolhouses" and the like, are just to evade the Truth, since to acknowledge and live the Truth would hinder pleasure in the flesh—and no kingdom will work against its own Kingdom. "The Devil"—flesh—will not work against its own. To "feed the lambs and sheep" we must

abide by the Truth, for, the lambs and sheep are not people, but the Truth and Love of the same that has been "slaughtered" by Error and the Love of it. This Truth and Love of the same, is "the fold" that man must "enter"—entertain—for thereby he will be "entertaining angels unawares." To "feed" is to UPHOLD the Truth. When confronted by the "damsel," Peter did not uphold the Truth when he said "I know not the man," therefore, he fed or upheld a lie for fear of what might become of Peter if he then told the Truth about knowing Jesus. Jesus was condemned by the Pharisees because "he made himself the Son of God," which was the actual Truth of the Spirit—God—Thought in which he lived, and aimed to teach others to live the same, tho not the God-like, or the Christ-like ideas as preached then and now.

In Revelation 1: 10 and 11 it reads,—"I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and what thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven Churches which are in Asia: unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamor, and unto Thyatria, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.'"

We must admit that Revelation is composed mostly of words which are to be used as symbols of something, otherwise some of the remarks are queer and ludicrous and even absurd. St. John was under such a state of visionary seeing, and this accounts for the lucid tho queer to the view of the average mortal of the understanding of

Spiritual significance, and their symbolic meaning. He "was in the Spirit" because he lived very much from the world as Jesus did, which was the reason also that "Jesus loved this disciple," more than the others, just as one man who drinks liquor, loves to be in company with one who does likewise.

The words "Behind me" signifies that as Paul says, The natural man "cannot see this form"—hear this great voice," because it is perceived only thru the Spiritual Sense of Sight—"it is spiritually discerned"—which "as a trumpet" signifies filling space or "everywhere present," and not coming FROM HEAVEN or ANY LOCALITY, but IS, for, as it says, "as OF a trumpet"—the word trumpet is symbolic of signifying volume in expansion of space, and is "the first and the last" because it is the Universal Law of Truth to be the first and the last, or, "the beginning and ending" —"Alpha and Omega." The "seven churches" referred to, are symbolic of all and any religious denominations giving out their different views, which may be likened to the "seven" religious denominations given by Geo. Cram in his diagram of the world. These are,—the "Brahmins, Jews, Protestants, Greek Church, Roman Catholics, Mohammedans, and Buddhists." The "seven golden candlesticks" represent these religions as giving light to the world in the way of the Truth. It reads,—"the seven stars are the angels of the seven churches, and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches"—religions. We read of their being criticized in chapter two, altho it reads,—"For my name's sake hast thou

labored, and hast not fainted,"—"Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love." "Nevertheless, repent, and do the first works; Or else I will come unto thee quickly, and remove thy candlestick." We can imagine to-day that one by one the "candlestick" is being taken away from all such "doctrines" as is represented in the Church, because, while each Church is aiming to send out "Angels"—Thoughts as to Truth, they have and do fail to bring back good results. The "seven angels which stood before God" are also symbolic of the "seven churches," because they represent the many or different doctrines—angels—Thoughts of the "One angel." But when the "mighty angel came down from heaven," or the One angel of Truth, because there can be but One Doctrine of any Truth, we hear what the seven churches say to-day, as the representatives of religious creeds said in the time of Jesus, "Crucify him." They hear this mighty angel "with a loud voice as when a lion roareth; and when he had cried, seven thunders uttered their voices," which "seven thunders" symbolize the NOISE AND UPROAR made by the seven churches—religions—when again, or, the "second coming" is visible, in that to-day is the Scientific Truth which is the One Voice of Truth is sounded. But it says,—"SEAL UP THOSE THINGS WHICH THE SEVEN THUNDERS UTTERED, AND WRITE THEM NOT." Their time is come, because the "little book" is the One Doctrine—Book, and not the doctrines—"MANY BOOKS" that have sounded. "And he said unto me, Thou must prophesy again before many people,

and nations, and tongues, and kings." This "prophesy AGAIN," is significant of the fact that past opinions and beliefs are to be changed, or that the first prophecy as given by Jesus was not understood, so "again," Science must reveal to an ignorant generation what the Real Truth is concerning a Spiritual Life here, just as it has revealed the facts of organic life here, tho unbelieved by many to be as developed. The "reed like unto a rod" symbolizes a faith, tho not a faith—"reed shaken by the wind"—changed at will. A "reed and rod"—the word "rod" symbolizing a faith—"reed"—that will endure, because it is hardened to the test. The "rod" that will endure is able in "the measuring of the temple," which "measuring" signifies making a distinction between the temple —word of God, "which temple ye are," and the temple—Word of Satan, which temple ye are, so long as you manifest the opposite.

Both—Jew and Gentile, are represented as the "two witnesses," for, "both shall prophesy," which means that "all nations" shall be of the same mind and Thought in their work, since God—Thought does not favor one more than another, neither indeed can be, since Thought is no respecter of persons. The "four and twenty elders" which occupy the "four and twenty seats," is symbolic of the Greek Alphabet. Webster defines characters, or letters as "persons," so I conclude that the character, person and letter are synonyms, as used in Revelation to express the true character and reputation of the word. The Greek Alphabet, to my Knowledge, is the "twenty-four elders," because the Alphabet consists of twenty-four

characters, namely,—Alpha—"the beginning"—Beta, Yamma, Delta, Epsilon, Zeta, Eta, Theta, Iota, Kappa, Lamda, Mu, Nu, Xi, Omikron, Pi, Rho, Sigma, Tau, Upsilon, Phi, Chi, Psi, and Omega—"the ending"—"beginning and ending." These letters—"elders"—are significant of being "clothed in white" because white is the symbol of purity, so, Thought in such letters—characters—of Truth are the "crowns of gold" referred to here. "The throne" signifies or represents the Universal Consciousness in individual form—man. "Twenty-four seats" signify the foundation on which the twenty-four elders builded the Truth. The "four beasts" are symbols of Europe, Africa, Asia and America, and their possessions as earthly conditions, since, we cannot conceive of any animals—"beasts full of eyes BEFORE and BEHIND." The "eyes before and behind" are here significant of connections between the different countries—beasts, or that they are related to each other. "The first beast was like a lion," symbolizes Europe, which has represented strength as a beast of power, but like the lion that roars and boasts of its power, this monarch power cannot live forever, as it says,—"WAS like a lion." The "second beast like a calf," symbolizes Africa, because of its WEAKNESS and subjection to other powers—beasts. The "third beast had a face as a man," symbolizes Asia, because it is generally regarded as the birthplace of the human race—"man"—and the most ancient seat of civilization, as well as the locality in which Jesus appeared and did his works. The "fourth beast was like a flying eagle," symbolizes America, because of its being more

separate as the wings of an eagle would indicate this, and by this separation develops independency, which naturally develops a Higher Thought and form of government, and soon becomes recognized by the other powers—beasts—as ABOVE and SUPERIOR to them, as "a flying eagle" symbolizes this.

In Rev. 13: 18, it reads,—"Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man, and his number is six hundred threescore and six." The number of the beast is the same as the man, because they are on an equal footing, or cannot be represented without each other and here, the beast is Evil, and man—the beast part is evil, therefore their number is ALIKE, or, his number is 666 or is equal as will be seen by his number. So "the name of the beast," or number of his name "are many evils," as we read in Mark 5: 7. "And he asked him, What is thy name? and he answered, saying, My NAME is legion: for we are many." So "the number of the beast" is "legion"—many evils, and is the number of a man—men, because many live with "the beast." The beast here takes on the form of disease referred to in Mark, because beast is Material and Evil is Material—Natural, while the "four beasts" referred to above represents the world, because the world is Material. "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord," that is, the idea of the life in mortality is being removed by the Knowledge—Resurrection of immortality as present instead of future. And THEN, "Satan is bound" by the fact that God is loosed. "And whosoever was not found written in the book of

life, was cast into the lake of fire." That is,—all doctrines as "written in the books" concerning material life and death and the evil thereof, are cast aside, or into the "lake of fire"—burning Truth, because they are not of, nor can they be "written in the book of life." "Books of life" symbolizes MORE THAN ONE Doctrine or Creed, while "Book" is a symbol of One Doctrine —Christ. Again it says,—"And death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them, and they were judged every man according to their works." "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." The "doctrines written in the books" being "whosoever,"—material ideas, are what "death and hell delivered up" when the Truth became known, for it was they —evil doctrines which were in them because they were of them. Note with me, that it does not say "every man" is judged according to HIS WORK, but according to "THEIR WORKS." If the word "every" had not been connected with the word "man," then it might be possible to believe it referred to man that "works," and should be judged accordingly. But the word "works" in connection with "their" and the word "every" in connection with the word "man," cannot be associated together as man who works or that it is man who speaks. If it read every man according to his work, it could refer to man directly, as the one who works, but by adding the S to work, and their to works, it signifies that they were judged every man according to what works, which is the work of Evil, or "their works," making as I have said all along and aim to prove it is God and

Satan—Good and Evil working, and that no man is condemned hereafter for the work of Evil, but is condemned or not according to Good and Evil working here. Jesus gives my exact idea, when he said "every man shall be scattered to HIS own," because it draws out my meaning, or that the remark made here in Revelation cannot refer to you or man directly when it says "every man according to THEIR works." It should be a singular word—"HIS," instead of the plural word—"their," if it referred to man directly, because the word "every" gives the plural meaning to the sentence. The work of the Natural Thoughts are known or judged—understood by "THEIR WORKS" to be corrupt, in that the Natural is against the Spiritual, or "the flesh lusteth against the Spirit," since, the "tree is known by its fruit." "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire," signifies that only THE IDEA of death and hell were cast into the lake of fire, or, that such ideas cannot be forever, or called the Truth, but are destroyed when the Truth is known, which is "the lake of fire," for "death and hell" are not men, but the result of Evil and Material conditions. They will be destroyed—abolished, or burned by "the lake of fire," which Truth—Fire is the Spirit that is always burning to destroy the opposite conditions of life. In this verse it corroborates my former statement that the Natural belief or worldly condition which IS "death and hell" to man, is the "SECOND DEATH," for, it says,—"And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. THIS IS THE SECOND DEATH." I again repeat that it does not refer to man—you—but is the work of

Evil, tho man or you must suffer in the Sense that you are Conscious of Evil, and you will enjoy in the Sense that you are Conscious of Good NOW. In 2nd Cor., 11th chapter, 14th and 15th verses it says, "And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works."

You will note here that "according to their works," refers to "ministers," or men, but the repetition of the word "ministers" in the same sentence makes it clear, that, while the ministers are men, they are "his ministers," or, showing as I argue that men—ministers are working according to HIS works—Satan—"the angel of light," and not according to the ministers as men, or "their works." Here again, "their works" can be applied to men, but not in the same meaning as "their works" quoted from Revelation. It is properly used here, because it uses the word ministers properly, or it does not read "every minister according to their works," or as using the plural meaning twice, when it should be used but once, as every minister according to HIS works, and not "every man according to their works." However, Paul is mistaken by referring to Satan as having "ministers of righteousness," because, as Jesus said, "every kingdom divided against itself cannot stand," tho Paul may have held the idea that Satan would be "reformed."

In Revelation where it speaks of "the souls of them that were slain," it signifies the Spirtual Senses of life embodied by man, which are con-

tinually working, but has been and is "slain"—not understood. Both—the Natural thinking, Senses—Souls—are working to THEIR OWN END, but the END of the Natural Senses or Souls is prophesied which is "death," while the END of the Spiritual Senses or Souls "IS life everlasting." The Natural Soul or Sense is Natural thinking, while the Spiritual SOUL or SENSE is Spiritual thinking, and as it says: these Spiritual Senses—"Souls HAVE BEEN slain"—MISUNDERSTOOD "for the word of God," but are now understood, as signified by the remark in Revelation, as "alive forevermore." "The souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus," are the same Senses that have been "beheaded"—slain or not understood "since the foundation of the world," but are now understood thru the destructive principles of the Natural Senses, which same are the diseased and death conditions of man. All Natural Senses of appetite shall be destroyed, which are destroying the character and health of man. The smoke emerging from "the bottomless pit" is significant of the result of the destruction of the Natural Sense, because it has no foundation in fact, therefore, "bottomless," while "the sun and the air" signifies the Spiritual—Eternal Light and Life, since, Sun and Air represent life. These Spiritual Senses of man "were darkened by reason of the smoke"—Natural being consumed, which were "of the pit." In this Natural Sense of life, "there came out of the smoke locusts upon the earth,"—that is, Natural Thoughts of the One Evil is represented by the form of "Locusts" in all forms of life.

It speaks of the "twelve tribes" being saved, and of "twelve foundations,"—but Paul says,—"For other foundation can no man lay than which IS LAID, which is Jesus Christ." So then, there can be but "one foundation," tho the "twelve" are SEEN and given by St. John, because of the twelve apostles teaching—working on the same foundation. "The city lieth four square and the length is as large as the breadth,"—which is symbolic of the Truth of Spiritual Life as always the same in Principle, and a Spiritual Creation, "whose builder and maker is God" or Thought, and not due to the individual or man directly. It has "a wall great and high that no man can build," which symbolizes that it is not a material structure, therefore, the Truth of Spiritual Life built as it says above, by God, and signifies the end of mortality. "And he measured the city with the reed twelve thousand furlongs, the length, and the breadth and the height are equal," which, if taken metaphorically, or as referring to anything but Spiritual Life in the form of Creation, would be absurd, since, man could not build, nor even measure such—"the height," nor live under such conditions. This simply illustrates that the Spiritual Idea or Christ of Life cannot be REACHED, BUILT OR MEASURED by the Natural Idea of Life, but is built by the Spiritual understanding, which is ABOVE the Material conception of life. "And he measured the wall thereof, an hundred and forty and four cubits." We have learned that the "Foundation" is the teaching of Truth in the Form of Spiritual Life, therefore, "the wall"—man built upon the Principle of this foundation, must

refer to the Spiritual Idea or Christ in "the image of God"—Thought. This you must agree with, when reading the latter part of the sentence which says,—"according to the measure of a man, that is of the angel"—which again, if taken figuratively would be absurd, since we cannot conceive of any man reaching such a height as "A hundred and forty and four cubits." It reads, "the measure of a man," and not a city and man, and continues by adding "THAT IS, of the angel,"—signifying, man is to reach the Highest conception of Life thru God as Thought—"THE ANGEL."

Thruout all the teaching by Jesus and his Apostles, some distinction and partiality was shown between the Jew and Gentile, which is not in direct accordance with the law of any Truth and Error, therefore not according to God and Satan—"Good and Evil," since God and Satan are "NO RESPECTER OF PERSONS." In my opinion, how truly was Jesus rebuked in his Conscience by this Universal Law of Truth as we read in Matthew 15: 24 to 28. "But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. "Then came she and worshipped him, saying, Lord help me! "But he answered and said, It is not meet to take the children's bread, and cast it to dogs. "And she said, Truth Lord; Yet the dogs eat the crumbs which fall from their masters' table. "Then Jesus answered and said unto her, O woman, great is thy faith." The general sentiment of the people seems to be that Jesus was here testing the "faith" of those present and the woman. But the above and last remark made by the woman simply illustrates the partiality

shown by Jesus and all men generally. This is also the reason why the ignorant people of his time and the present, were and are led to believe in "master" and "servant," and continue to eat "the crumbs which fall from their masters' table," in the way of small earnings, when they are the source thru which most of the earnings have been made. But there shall be no "masters" and "servants" when the true brotherhood of man shall be known and lived, yet, all will be servants, in the true sense of the word. This is not the first time Jesus had to say "Not my will, but thine be done." Emerson says,—"Jesus would absorb the race: but Tom Paine, or the coarsest blasphemer helps humanity by resisting this exuberance of power."

We read in Matthew 22: 41 to 46,—"While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, "saying, what think ye of Christ? Whose Son is he?" "They say unto him, the Son of David. "He saith unto them, How then doth David in Spirit call him Lord, saying, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? "If David then call him Lord, how is he his Son? "And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any Man, from that day forth, ask any more questions." These few verses contain the Whole Letter of the Christ, which is the Spirit, the Word, and the Truth of Life. The correct interpretation will disclose the fact that Christ is no Eternal connection to Jesus, with Jesus, and so, not the Son of David as Jesus here cites, altho Jesus was the offspring—lineage of David after the form and

continued law of the Natural Creation. "They say unto him, the Son of David," but, David in Spirit, called Christ or God, "My Lord," therefore, Christ could not be the Son of David, as Jesus says, "If David then call him Lord, how is he his Son?" IT illustrates that when David looked above and away from the Natural and Temporal conception of life, or "David in Spirit," to the Spiritual and Eternal conception of Life, he beheld Christ—"my Lord"—which Christ is God, because "I and my Father are ONE."

We read in Matthew 24: 22, "And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved, but for the elects' sake those days shall be shortened." This plainly tells of the MAN OF TO-DAY, which shall not be the MAN OF TO-MORROW, or that there is no escaping the Evolution of Thought and Man, any more than man could escape the Evolution of Natural formation, and ask the foolish question, "What am I here for, or Why am I here," when he is here because he cannot escape existing conditions, and the fact he is here because his parents were married. "The elects' sake" signifies Evolution, and to repeat Emerson: "If John was perfect, why are you and I alive?" Paul says, "without us," or, as we appear to-day,—flesh and Spirit—"the elects" could not reach the height of Perfection, or, if man could reach the height of Perfection without flesh, "there should no flesh be saved."

Paul says, "For the law of the Spirit of Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of Sin and death," AS MUCH AS I AM ABLE TO ABIDE BY THAT LAW. In other words, Paul received

the law relating to the Spiritual Life and so was not under the belief of the law of sin and death, or, that man should not be under the belief of a law of sin and death, which is material, and then expect to reach the Spiritual Life hereafter. He simply received and acknowledged the law of Truth—"new law"—but because of living under "the law of sin and death"—"old law"—before the understanding of the new law came to him as it must come to all, he was in part subject (all men are and will be until the old law is entirely abolished—destroyed), to the old law, from the very fact that that part of life lived under the Natural Law, was, and is Material. We are not entirely free from all worldly Thoughts—old law—and conditions at this period, neither indeed can be, under the present existence, but it is OUR WORK thru the Work of Thought in the form of Truth—new law—to destroy the old law of "sin and death." This can only be accomplished by not recognizing any more than possible "the law of sin and death," since, the only way to destroy anything is to have only one in mind, as it says, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." We have worshipped Jesus and the like, but we find as he says, "there is no good in me." In Revelation, it says, "Worship thou God, and not Jesus, for, "I am thy fellow servant also, worship thou not me."

The word Christian is derived from the word Christ, therefore, to be a Christian, one should really live the Christ life only. But, we have looked up to Jesus and others generally who aim to hold themselves equal to him, therefore, we cannot expect to grow towards the Spiritual, if

we recognize the Material or Jesus as "the Christ." We call ourselves Christians and some others we call Infidels and Heathen, when there is not one of us—Christian, Heathen or Infidel who has lived up to the Christ and so cannot be Christian, but in NAME only. So, there is not a Christian to-day, in fact, we could not live such a life under the present conditions. Jesus only revealed the Christ, and therefore the Christian Idea of life, for, he did not live it, neither could he, because it was impossible then, as it is now impossible to live the Christ-Idea in its True Sense or Soul of an existence. Jesus was "the man of sorrows," because he looked at others living in happiness to a certain extent under a law he was not teaching, and because it was no more than Natural. Jesus and Paul had not lived without this desire and experience, when we consider the conditions of their time, for, it was so much more Natural—Animal—than in the present, because we are living in a more Spiritual or Mental state of existence because of the growth of the Mental. Paul's remark,—"He was in all points tempted like as we," is significant that Jesus at some time had yielded, for, in no other way is it possible for man to know the opposites unless he can experience both. The man who has never indulged in liquor, is no authority on prohibition, because he does not know what his experience would be to the point of explanation. If the people believed Jesus supernatural, and do believe such, this is not proof that such was and is the case, since, no man is able to know the exact life of another, especially in such private matters as these, because he can have no proofs of the same.

Besides, it would be absurd to use the word "fast" in connection with the life of Jesus, or any person, if he or that person had not been tempted and yielded. We will not consider the present day theory of "smatterers" in Religion, as in the time of Jesus, they taught the "fast" as referring to food, which we find from the words of Paul and Jesus it is the "lust of the flesh," to abstain from. The word fast would lose its significance if you did not ABSTAIN from doing or using that which you were in the HABIT of doing or using. So, the animal—flesh—or brute nature still predominates in some, more than in others.

While I have aimed to prove that the word Christ—Christian does not refer to the general life of man, but as dealing with the character, or the Spiritual in that it is above the material and indulgence, we will refer to it—Christian as a part of the general life, simply because it has been and is used thru custom to be so. I read an article in a newspaper recently, telling of "Christians in Russia killing the Jews." This is really amusing, when we consider the inconsistency of the same, or that it is and should be characteristic of a Christian in the act of killing. It is only characteristic of Barbarians or Cannibals to kill, yet, we uphold and kill each other, and cry "Christian" as applied to ourselves, while we cry "heathen" and also try to Christianize them. "There shall be wars" simply illustrates the existence of brute nature, which cannot cease until this selfishness and hatred of "Nation against Nation" shall be abolished with a more brotherly feeling. Spencer illustrates the non-brotherly feeling in the following,—"If

the due performance by the state of its all-essential function had been the question on which elections were fought, we should not see, as we do now, that a shivering cottager who steals palings for firewood, or a hungry tramp who robs an orchard, gets punishment in more than the Hebrew measure, while great financial frauds which ruin their thousands bring no punishment."

We had better stop propagation at once, and thereby save the trouble and expense to a family, if we are only to send the increase to be slain in war. Here again, we find there are "inducements" offered persons to become married, and also that they should raise "large families." However, the ones who advocate this, are those who are the least interested in that they raise no large families. This being the case, it plainly shows why the other fellow should raise large families, since, many children in a family keep the head of the family "on the rocks." This sums up the whole thing, in that the large families are an asset to the money king, who raises few children. I argue that it is a crime for the parent to bring into the world any more of their like than they are able to support. And "support" in this generation does not mean—like the animal—ONLY AN EXISTENCE, as many are obtaining to-day. It means a thoro education in all which tends to build up soul and body. Reform and right cannot be brought about by war. So it is easy for me to sit in office and tell others what to do, especially, if I have no part in the disaster, and really reap the benefit and reward that others really won thru death in war. Is it not time then in which the people

shall not be governed by the few, since the people are they who have done the fighting for freedom? but only receive more "bondage" and less freedom. What Hypocrisy! in the name of God, as it is given out to the troops by the Rulers that it is so, when it is for their own selfish gain. Jesus said "Woe unto you also, ye lawyers: for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burden with one of your fingers." How true this is of the law makers generally. They make such laws to suit themselves, or Sunday laws,—but if they were compelled to fill them, they would not "be able to bear them." In other words, they are men of leisure, as their office has no restriction over time generally, and with plenty of time outside of Sunday, for all kinds of amusements and the like; the laws which they make for Sunday, trouble them not. These same persons would not "touch the burden" with their own hands, which they throw upon the shoulders of others. They, as did the Pharisees, may do other things on Sunday which would be less in keeping with, and contrary to the Spirit of God. Think of the graft that most of them plot during the week, and make PRETENSE of obeying the Truth by going to Church on Sunday. No wonder Jesus was compelled to talk outside of the Church, or to "THE MULTITUDES" instead of THE FEW. He illustrated this by saying: "A rich man can hardly enter the kingdom of heaven" —that is, A man looking only to money as his God, cannot entertain the Spirit of a better and Higher life. Those who have tried to satisfy themselves with the general principle of religious be-

liefs are awakening to the fact that such is not furnishing positive proof as to its Truth, because of an unsatisfied generation which is so prevalent. We find that the true spirit is not to condemn your brother for what SEEMS to you an evil, while in YOUR OWN HEART there lie many faults. The only evils then to condemn, whether it be on Sunday or a week day, are those which interfere with the homes of others, as we read in Exodus 21: 17. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor anything that is thy neighbor's." THESE THINGS, are wrong at any time, but, as Jesus says,—"To eat with unwashed hands defileth not the man," for IT IS ONLY A CUSTOM, which is followed to-day more than the Truth. If you deny a man his rights, by shutting him off from innocent amusements, you are only seeing to it, that he lives up to YOUR LAWS, instead of the laws of Truth. We should be allowed to open any legitimate business on Sunday (any other ought to be closed ALL THE TIME, but because of those who are not able to overcome certain things they are open, and should, in this case, be open), or attend any respectable entertainment when we feel disposed to do so, and should there be any disturbance among the spectators, we have officers who should look after them. But because of a few that would make trouble ANY TIME AND PLACE, it should not be considered that those of a peaceful mind should suffer. But, here it is again, the majority must suffer for the work of the few, as in law making and the like.

We make Sunday laws because the ancient writers HAD A VISION, or more properly speaking, an insane idea that God "worked six days and rested on the seventh," and, of course, if God worked only six, it must be a sin for man to work seven days. To even "hint" that to do a work of any kind, or in pleasure of anything that is considered "good," that such would be evil, is too absurd for consideration. But here again we aim to please ourselves, in order to avoid living after the Truth, because the Truth would say "it is evil to do evil every day in the week." It is with rest and sleep like many other things in the world of Progress, for, as man becomes more Spiritual in the Highest Sense of Thought, he can do with less sleep, since, sleep is characteristic of the animal or brute nature. In other words, the physical and its work, require more sleep than the Mental and its work. The Spiritual or Mental characteristic is illustrated in the remark made by Jesus to the disciples,—"What: will ye not watch with me one hour?" If they had been as Spiritual as Jesus, they too, would have been awake with him. One believing more in nature will require more sleep because he believes and gives up more to nature.

There is a vast difference in the word "rest" as contained in Genesis, and the "rest" of the New Testament, as to how it is used. In Matthew 11: 28, 29 and 30, it reads,—"Come unto me, all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. "Take my yoke upon you: and learn of me: for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. "For my yoke IS EASY

and my burden is light." The "yoke" here illustrates how much lighter a burden is to a person understanding the way to overcome all things of the world. In Genesis 22,—we are taught to "believe" God worked six, and then rested on the seventh day, but it follows in the same chapter 2-5, that "God made every plant before it grew," —showing that the writer knew nothing of what he was writing, or, that he was always "at sea"—tossed about by this or that belief, which illustrates ignorance as will be observed by the two very different and contrary ideas, tho one may "believe" this latter refers to "plant" life and the like, which, if it did, is contrary to a required length of time for growth.

There remains no doubt in my mind but what man requires a certain amount of rest from labor,—this is natural because we are more or less natural by the more or less physical work we do. But, this is not necessarily so with the Mental, nor with Thought, since, we know these are in a working state in one form of working during the physical relaxation or sleep. But the "rest" from labor is not the rest to which Jesus refers, and that the "SOULS"—your Senses will be at "rest" if you will look more to the Idea of life he taught.

So then, we find that only in a few instances did Jesus refer to the Sabbath, and then, not that it should be observed as a day of "rest," because it was not to be considered as having any great bearing on what he wished to impress in regard to Truth. But he mentioned it enough to illustrate that it is RIGHT TO DO RIGHT, and WRONG TO DO WRONG, SEVEN DAYS IN A WEEK, or,

regardless of time and days. The Pharisees then, and those who believe now the same, could and cannot submit to a Good—God act if it were and is done on a Sunday—Sabbath. Then too, we have a religious "belief" based on a Saturday as a Sabbath, and, of course, like everything else in Religion it is overlooked with the idea that if we observe "one day out of a week," we are excusable. Many times thruout the teaching of Jesus, we find utter contempt by the Pharisees for him, because he did an act of Good—God on Sunday, or illustrated the fact that an evil is an evil any time, and Good is Good at any time, because "God is the same yesterday, to-day and forever," just as Satan is the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever, in that the Principle is always the same. But it was not their OPINION of Good, just as the opinion of God is held by others to-day, and so, did not permit them and us of doing Evil, that it pierced their heart as Truth always hurts. Jesus said "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," which is significant that man is not subject—controlled by the day—Sabbath, but has control of the day, or that the Sabbath shall be used to his own discretion and will, even if it be to do an act of Good, or an act of Evil. It is not so much the day, but rather to "serve the Lord day and night"—do that which is called good, seven days, or continually, as "day and night" signifies. You claim it is wrong to steal, therefore, it being wrong, one is just as liable ONE DAY AS ANOTHER. If you claim it is right to play ball (playing ball, and the like, have nothing to do with Good and Evil, since they have nothing to do

with the character of man, but use the phrase here as a "substitute" for Good because it is "customary" to refer to such as being at one time good, and at another time evil), or to attend a Theatre, or to open a store and do business, it could not come under the heading of that which is wrong, by that very assertion. Jesus said precisely the same meaning when he said,—"Then said Jesus unto them, I will ask you ONE THING: Is it lawful on the Sabbath days TO DO GOOD OR TO DO EVIL?" What need we of any better argument? Could you ask for a better explanation than this? So then, we are more apt to make laws to suit ourselves, rather than that which pertains to how we shall reach the state of Spirituality, which is nothing but a state of Higher Mentality. We each seem to have a law of our own in regard to what is right and wrong. One says,—I do not believe in card playing, but dancing is all right and good. Another says,—Card playing is proper and good, but dancing is an evil. Who is right? As said before, in regard to what is right and wrong, both cannot be right nor wrong. It is then, the Good and Evil Thought you may entertain against or for the ones whom you associate with at either, which work for Good or for Evil to those with whom you come in contact, and this may chance to be on one day or another. You need not be at a card party, nor at a dance, in order to have these feelings. What a pretty state of affairs it would be if the card players were in the majority, and made the law to that effect. It would be a crime and the same unrest of the Senses—Souls, to think that the dancers would have to play cards against their

will or not amuse themselves at all if card playing became a law as to the only amusement. Now, there are just as foolish and absurd laws as these that are made to-day, and even enforced. You and I have talked with the "Narrow minded" who have said what they would do if they had the power. Why condemn ball playing, and the like, and those who attend it in Sunday, if it is right at other times? No wonder Jesus said,—"O generation of vipers: how can ye, being evil speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Here we find that it is not the business that a man is in, not the amusement he wishes to attend, that are contrary to that which is good, and therefore an evil and a wrong, nor does it concern the day in which they are practised. It is the Evil Thoughts which are contrary to the Law of God—Good Thought and you may have these, and are just as subject to them, whether it be in your own home, or at the ball game (more liable at the former place, because evil suggestions are not at the latter, neither could they act there), and at all times or days alike. I am thankful to have Sunday, or even one day in a week as a day of leisure, and a day free from all business cares,—but, and if I wish to attend a ball game, a Theatre, or TAKE A BATH, I should be allowed that liberty. It is mine—this liberty, so long as I cause no trouble in the way of intruding on another's property. This is the only wrong that can be answered for by one man to another, or where a law should be made to answer for, and therefore concerns man, but is no relation to the Good and Evil Jesus aimed to teach, because they do not

concern the character of man. Nature alone deals with the physical works, and if we are overworked, we are working against nature. Any kind of labor should not be overtaxed, yet, the very persons who generally stand at the head of law and make these laws, are they, who generally overtax their help on Sunday as well as other days. If you would preach to them as it says in the Old Testament, "that man should earn his bread by the sweat of his brow," they care not to listen to such a "law," since, they care more to earn their bread by the sweat of other's "brow." Should I then, be condemned and fined if I fail to satisfy a law that is ONE MAN MADE, or is suggested by one, and then voted on by a privileged few? One man said "We have got to make laws and look out for these people"—referring to those HE CALLED ignorant and sinful. He is a man in business, and one I know is not at all times honest in his business methods, yet, he would be willing to look after the "other fellow." It seems absurd to attempt to Christianize a people by taking away what seems right to them, so long as they do no injury to you, while you use your rights that are wrong to them. It is only because one or the other is in the majority that they use their RIGHTS WRONG.

"But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that this it must be." That is, no form of life can exist than what is characteristic with the times in which it exists, and all mortality which is a form of selfishness in different forms of life must be "FULFILLED"—ENDED, before immortality can be reached. This has been and is "the law and the

prophets." Prophecy is made under the conditions which exist, since, Man, or a prophet can look back and see the advanced change made from one generation to another, and by so doing he is able to prophesy greater things for the future. These "Christians" under the different names in Religion you will note are not proving their worth in the name of God, but are causing many deaths, for, it says, "They that kill and do these things THINK they do God service." So then, it is not Religion, but Science that is changing us from worse to better, yet Religion has had and will have its part in that no great Truths have been reached without many views being defined.

The different views in Religion are but the result of thought development derived from many thoughts, the person holding this view having associated himself with the different environments. If I have criticized any Religion, it is not that I am criticizing that person or judging that person who holds that religious view, because, that person is only subject to what he thinks is religious, and should not be condemned for what he believes, since, you may have believed the same, and would have believed the same, if your environments and associates had been the same. "I judge no man," illustrates the fact that no man should be held up to ridicule for that which he believes and is therefore subject to, or, as Jesus said "if a man hear my words and do them not, I condemn him not." We are changing, not because of ourselves, but because the law of growth in Progress demands a change. If I have changed, and here express my view as different and seeming by some to be radi-

cal and "advanced," it is not because of my own individual view, but because I have associated myself with the different views and out of these has the thought formed my opinion in that all thought is formed by different Phenomena. The Jews in the time of Jesus were not so blind, and desired to "believe" in Jesus as the teacher of Truth, but were more or less guided by the fear they held of the other nations if they upheld the teaching. The same religious teaching then and now caused the Jews to say,—"If we believe in this fellow, the Romans will come and take our kingdom from us." The "CHIEF PRIESTS" said "CRUCIFY HIM." Evidently, the same feeling exists to-day in Russia by the killing of the Jews by "CHRISTIANS." We will have to confess some day that no other nationality is so liberal in their help towards mankind—their own especially, which is no more than natural—than the Jews. This is the commandment "to love your neighbor as yourself." Tho they are not called and considered a Christian people IN NAME, yet, they are more Christian in act, and that fulfills the commandment. How beautifully Shakespeare gives an account of them being even better than a Christian by the following words which he puts in the mouth of Shylock:

"I am a Jew: Hath not a Jew eyes? hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses (Souls) affections, passions? fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as a Christian? If you prick us do we not bleed? if you tickle

us, do we not laugh? if you poison us, do we not die? If we are like you in the rest, we will resemble you in that,—If a Jew wrong a Christian, what is his humility? revenge. If a Christian wrong a Jew, what should his sufferance be by a Christian's example? Why revenge—The villainy you teach me I will execute, and it shall go hard, but I will better the instruction." Note this last remark,—"I will better the instruction," or "villainy you teach me," tho "it shall go hard," or "work against the grain" of, or with the Jew to respect the Christian when he is chastised by the Christian—quite a sacrifice for the Jews to make, or, for any nationality when one is opposed to the other. I remember of a friend saying to a Rabbi,—"Your people seem all right in a way, but they are so dishonest," at which the Rabbi replied,—"Show me a person who is honest in any nation, and I will kiss him." This last expression—"kiss him"—smacks of more love than could be expressed in the Gentile for the Jew.

We are beginning to realize the fact that the word Christian, and the laws—especially Sunday laws are hardly in question as to the laws which treat of Spiritual growth, but really have a tendency to dwarf the same. Laws are continually being made to cover every atom of an existence so that man will in time if they are not checked, be bound so that he can no more connect himself with liberty, than he can connect himself with Christianity. Many laws are made for the purpose of gaining an office for the laws made, and not that there lies in the heart of the man who suggests that or this—that he is working for the benefit of

man. "He has an ax to grind." I have just read that in Kansas there is a law to "tax bachelors," but it is the by-word that in Kansas "they do queer things," so we will not consider that such a law will become universal. There are plenty of men who would be glad to marry if they could support a woman as she wants to be supported, and as he would like to support her, which is impossible in most cases under the present conditions, and which conditions are generally made by that class of persons who propose such laws, since, it is not so much against the fact that he is a bachelor, but because they are working for the "easy money" end of it. It is just as illegitimate to gain money for yourself and state by such laws as it is for a corporation to fleece money out of its employees. The man is not always at fault in regard to whether he should get married, since it requires TWO PERSONS in anything to make a bargain. Woman is just as much to blame for the unmarriageable condition as man, and even more so in the present generation, because she is becoming more independent of man. There are many of both sexes who should not marry, even if they should wish to, or are FORCED to it by such laws in case they do not care to pay a fine, for the reason that they are unfit for propagation, and ought not to marry, and would you force such to pay a fine? There has much been said about the "venereal disease" of man as the cause of many unhealthy children, of which no one can deny, but I argue that there are as many "weaklings" in the world to-day as a result thru the "abuse" of nature. This being the case, it is not necessarily the man being at

fault always in diseased children, because women are more given up to this than men, from the very fact that man is allowed thru "custom" to indulge in nature, and at the same time retain his "manhood," while woman—poor creature—will lose her "womanhood" if she satisfies her passion before getting married. Many generations of families are dying out, and should be let to die out before they put upon the market as we see it to-day—goods unmarketable, and so should not be let to run their full course. This tax, for selfish gain, and it is for nothing else, reminds me of the "city clerk" who some years ago said it was right to raise the dog tax from one to a dollar and a half. He invented a metal tag costing about five dollars a hundred. For each one, and writing out the dog license he received the additional half dollar over and above his salary. A nice income for himself and the clerks to follow, and well worth the time to make such a law that the poor "always have with them." This is just one instance of the laws that are made for the benefit of those who make them. Every person should be allowed to live according to the dictations of THEIR OWN CONSCIENCE, when it concerns their PRIVATE affairs as in marriage and Religion, and therefore not be compelled to pay "a fine" to the state and religion, for that which does not concern the state and religion. When a man tells me whether I shall marry or not, he certainly, ABOVE ALL THINGS, is trying to manage my PRIVATE AFFAIRS, for, that REALLY concerns me, and most of all MY CONSCIENCE, which latter I MUST and shall be controlled by,

else, there would be no "rest for my soul"—Sense.

We all dislike anarchy, but we are really breeding anarchists, therefore, we should lessen in ourselves that which produces them. We ought not to complain of a thing we breed, but rather stop the process of breeding. You may have a kind dog, but if you continually kick him, do not object if the poor ignorant animal turns upon and bites you. This is his only method of defense, just as it is with the ignorant and poor worker who is being kicked about and "lawed" against more than his keeper. Rather give the dog and him credit for having more sense of feeling than yourself, since, you, being "wise," caused the anger which produced the bite. You must abolish laws that are anarchistic, if you wish to abolish anarchy, or abolish the cause of anarchy, if you wish to destroy anarchists. Education is the only step by which the ignorant are made wise. The ignorant have generally been held in ignorance by those who are educated and know better. Of course it requires time and patience to put up with the law of growth as to all men being on an equal footing, or as to the "brotherhood of man," or, to "love your neighbor as yourself." Not until all have reached the education of Mentality being superior to the Physical as how to overcome hard work will there be much improvement for all mankind, since, if the horse had any sense, he would not pull the load. This law agaist bachelors in making them pay a fine, is not according to the teaching of Jesus and Paul, and therefore, not Christian in its true definition. The law of nature is even against the law of God, because Thought

in the Form of God is "against the flesh," and "the flesh is against the Spirit." Jesus made this "Revelation" which seems so complicated in the verse of St. John. You claim to teach "Christ" as YOUR doctrine, yet, you make laws against this Revelation and Knowledge which is to be Resurrected—Acknowledged. Paul said "I would have ALL MEN even as myself," which signifies "the bachelor." Why did Paul and Jesus preach "celibacy," if it were not as Paul says for "all men," instead of as we see it to-day being lived by "a few?" How are you going to get around THIS LAW, laid down By Jesus, and enforce your law of marriage? This is the True Revelation of the Truth, and when it is known, we will not say in the words of Pilate—"What is Truth?

There have been and are many bachelors who have been and are more of a help towards uplifting the race than the married man. Not only Jesus and Paul from a religious standpoint, but, Herbert Spencer, Henry Thoreau, Michelangelo, Sir Isaac Newton, George Peabody, Emmanuel Kant and others I cannot just now recall have furnished us with wonderful Truths in their respective lines. Paul said,—"He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord: But he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please HIS wife. "There is a difference ALSO between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit,—but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband." The idea that

Paul conveyed is not necessarily to the effect that the married man and the married woman are not capable to some extent to teach, but it illustrates how much more time one has in which to teach and work at any certain thing, because the persons who devote all of their time to a certain vocation, are better adapted for the same, than those who work at that or this. It, too, illustrates the fact that the single person can PROVE things where a married person is not in a position to prove, and so, has "authority" for what she or he claims.

Jesus spoke of woman making her choice in life when he said to Martha,—"But one thing is needful: and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her." These words here illustrate the single life, or, that Mary was better qualified to "serve the Lord"—the Truth as Jesus was teaching, and Martha, that of the house, tho neither were married, but it is evident here that Martha was more in favor of serving the man, or better qualified for the home, as it says,—"But Martha was cumbered about much serving, and came to him and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone,"—then, Jesus made the aforesaid remark.

In speaking of Religion, Herbert Spencer writes, —"For its essentially valid belief, Religion has constantly done better. Gross as were the disguises under which it first espoused this belief, and cherished this belief, though it still is, under disfiguring vestments, it has never ceased to maintain and defend it. It has everywhere established and propagated one or other modifications of a Power that transcends our knowledge. Though from age

to age Science has continually defeated it wherever they have come in collision, and has obliged it to relinquish one or more of its postions,—it has still held the remaining ones with undiminished tenacity. No exposure of the logical inconsistency of its conclusions—no proof that each of its particular dogmas was absurd, has been able to weaken its allegiance to that ultimate verity for which it stands. After criticism has abolished all its arguments and reduced it to silence, there has still remained with it the indestructible consciousness of a Truth which however faulty the mode in which it has been expressed, was yet a truth beyond cavil. To this connection its adherence has been substantially sincere. And for the guardianship and diffusion of it, Humanity has ever been, and must ever be its debtor.

"But while from the beginning, Religion has had the all-essential office of preventing man from being wholly absolved in the relative or immediate, and of awakening them to a consciousness of something beyond it, this office has been very imperfectly discharged. Religion has ever been more or less irreligious,—and it continues to be partially irreligious even now. In the first place, as implied above, it has all along professed to have some knowledge of that which transcends knowledge,—and has so contradicted its teachings. While with one breath it has asserted that the Cause of all things passes understanding, it has, with the next breath, asserted that the Cause of all things possesses such or such attributes—can be in so far understood. In the second place, while in great part sincere in its fealty to the great truth it has had to

uphold, it has often been insincere, and consequently irreligious, in maintaining the untenable doctrines by which it has obscured this great truth. Each assertion respecting the nature, acts, or motives of that Power which the universe manifests to us, has been repeatedly called in question, and proved to be inconsistent with itself, or with accompanying assertions. Yet each of them has been age after age insisted on, in spite of a secret consciousness that it would not bear examination. Just as though unaware that its central position was impregnable, Religion has obstinately held every outpost long after it was obviously indefensible. And this naturally introduces us to the third and most serious form of irreligion which Religion has displayed: namely, an imperfect belief in that which it professes to believe. How truly its central position is impregnable, Religion has never adequately realized. In the devoutest faith as we habitually see it, there lies hidden an innermost core of scepticism,—which causes that dread of inquiry displayed by Religion when face to face with Science. Obliged to abandon one by one the superstitions it once tenaciously held, and daily finding its cherished beliefs more and more shaken, Religion shows a secret fear that all things may some day be explained,—and thus itself betrays a lurking doubt whether that Incomprehensible Cause of which it is conscious, is really incomprehensible.

"Of religion then, we must all remember, that amid its many errors and corruptions it has asserted and diffused a supreme verity.

"The truly religious element of Religion has always been good,—that which has proved untenable in doctrine and vicious in practise, has been its irreligious element,—and from this it has ever been undergoing purification.

"And now observe that all along, the agent which has effected the purification has been Science. We habitually overlook the fact that this has been one of its functions. Religion ignores its immense debt to Science,—and Science is scarcely at all conscious how much Religion owes it. Yet it is demonstrable that every step by which Religion has progressed from its first low conception to the comparatively high one it has now reached, Science has helped it, or rather forced it, to take; and that even now, Science is urging further steps in the same direction.

"Using the word Science in its true sense, as comprehending all positive and definite knowledge of the order existing among surrounding phenomena, it becomes manifest that from the outset, the discovery of an established order has modified that conception of disorder, or undermined order, which underlies every superstition. As fast as experience proves that certain familiar changes always happen in the same sequence, there begins to fade from the mind the conception of a special personality to whose variable will they were before ascribed. And when, step by step, accumulating observations do the like with the less familiar changes, similar modification of belief takes place with respect to them.

"While this process seems to those who effect, and those who undergo it, an anti-religious one,

it is really the reverse. Instead of the specific comprehensible agency before assigned, there is substituted a less specific and less comprehensible agency,—and though this, standing in opposition to the previous one, cannot at first call forth the same feeling, yet, as being less comprehensible, it must eventually call forth this feeling more fully. Take an instance. Of old the Sun was regarded as the chariot of a god, drawn by horses. How far the idea thus grossly expressed, was idealized, we need not inquire. It suffices to remark that this accounting for the apparent motion of the Sun by an agency like certain visible terrestrial agencies, reduced a daily wonder to the level of the commonest intellect. When, many centuries after, Kepler discovered that the planets moved round the Sun ellipses and described equal areas in equal times, he concluded that in each planet there must exist a spirit to guide its movements. Here we see that with the progress of Science, there had disappeared the idea of a gross mechanical traction, such as was first assigned to the Sun; but that while for this there was substituted an indefinite and less easily conceivable force, it was still thought needful to assume a special personal agent as a cause of the regular irregularity of motion. When, finally, it was proved that these planetary revolutions with all their variations and disturbances, conformed to one universal law—when the presiding spirits which Kepler conceived were set aside, and the force of gravitation put in their place,—the change was really the abolition of an imaginable agency, and the substitution of an unimaginable one. Newton himself confessed the force of gravitation to be in-

comprehensible without the intermediation of an ether; and, as we have already seen, the assumption of an ether does not in the least help us. Thus it is with Science in general. Its progress in grouping particular relations of phenomena under laws, and these special laws more and more general, is of necessity a progress to causes that are more and more abstract. And causes more and more abstract, are of necessity causes less and less conceivable, since the formation of an abstract conception involves the dropping of certain concrete elements of thought. And so is justified the assertion, that the beliefs which Science has forced upon Religion, have been intrinsically more religious than those which they supplanted."

In this—the day of understanding, or "the day of judgment," we are beginning to realize the Truth which Science has forced Religion to adopt, because we are proving that experience and observation alone transcends all knowledge, and, even tho the knowledge gained from past experience is different in our knowledge, it is only because "the more and more abstract" have been "causes less and less conceivable." To Religion, "Humanity has ever been, and ever must be its debtor,"—not because it is the formula of an exact truth, but because it is the one thing to which man holds religious,—in that he is subject to a greater Power which he has not been able to conceive as a state of Mentality, and conceivable only as a Power greater than that which lies in the Physical. And, so too, because thru fear he has been led to believe he should remain in ignorance as to what the "Unknown Cause" is like. But

after becoming wise to the fact that ignorance cannot be the builder of an exact Science, he, thru past experiences has developed to a state of Knowledge wherein lies the fact that all phenomena is the resultant by growth not only in the Physical, but in the Psychological, since, Evolution of any phenomena is the Physical and Psychological of that phenomena. Spencer says "we know nothing more of existence than a continued manifestation," which is enough to know, because our experience and observation tell us only things can exist by what they are in the phenomena, and, "HE THAT HATH SEEN ME, HATH SEEN THE FATHER ALSO." That is, the Physical is the phenomena of the Psychological—both concrete in form, but abstract in their meaning. Religion has "professed to have some knowledge of that which transcends knowledge," because it has ever taught there is a beyond to which you and I are an existence, when we only exist by what exists to-day, since, Thought and Physical cannot exist but by what exists in the phenomena.

We have now reached that generation of which Spencer speaks,—"Religion shows a secret fear that all things may some day be explained—and thus itself betrays a lurking doubt whether that Incomprehensible of which it is conscious, is really incomprehensible." We shall not continue to say "this man's life was mapped out for him," or "things are so and so predestined," when we should know that all life existence is by growth in both the Physical and Psychological. This generation has brought about a new and somewhat different Religion, because this is the age of a greater and more universal Mentality.

This new form of Religion termed "Christian Science" has advanced rapidly because it is more in tune with the Mental, than with the Physical, and, therefore characteristic with the Evolution of Thought in the form of "Good" to be manifested as life than the organic. But because it also teaches this life as "continued" by this or that person, or in the term of "another life" distinct or separate from this, it too, lessens in itself to build a Spiritual life in "this world"—this world, because "the other world" as a Spiritual manifestation cannot exist HERE, until THIS WORLD—the Natural existence shall have finished its course—"nature works to her own end." Do not here be drawn away from conclusions reached by the explanation of the Thought and Physical as one, because it here alludes to the present Mental and Physical body. The explanation of a definition can hardly be explained in words, for, it is easy to form opinion by one explanation only to be contradicted by the same form of explanation, or, to repeat Spencer: "We can only speak of matter in terms of Mind, and we can only speak of Mind in terms of Matter." In other words: while the Mental and Physical are at present working as by a law, exist as a phenomena, yet, the phenomena of the Mental alone will exist as a phenomena when there shall be no use for the Physical as at present it is a phenomena with the Mental; just as a slight illustration, we have no use at present for wire in transmission of thought and the like; while heretofore it was impossible to send a message without the use of wire.

There is no doubt but that in her earlier stage of "searching the scriptures," that Mrs. Eddy was then led a great deal toward the Truth, as all are led toward this or that in proportion to their "seeking" anything, especially if it be from an impersonal view. But, like all persons building for "POMP," and even unconscious of its growth until it reaches such proportions where it cannot be checked, it hinders the builder from progressing, in that Evolution does not necessarily depend on the individual, so she, like all others at the "head" of a given thing, will release its hold on the Progress of Thought. It is because we have looked up to what the other fellow said that we are sometimes made his inferior. We can hardly expect to follow in the paths others have gone, tho they may be nearer the Truth in some things than we have experienced. My twelve years' study and work with the works, and "class instruction," of Mrs. Eddy, did not bring about the results that should follow such sincere desire to believe in all she said, and now I realize why, since, I know by experience that Knowledge is reached by experience which is a growth thru Thought of the same. We must get away from the idea of any "leader" of Truth, because Truth has no leader, but is a leader in itself. We can hardly call any person a "revelator" of Truth, but we can prophesy Truth from our experience and observation, and therefore experience and observe some of the Truth, but not ALL—the fulness of Truth, since, "THE END IS NOT YET." If there were such a thing as Infallibility to-day, there need be no effort to advance, for, we could not advance if we were

Infallible. It would be absurd for you to believe as I do, if it worked against your conscience, even if I speak the Truth. To your conscience a lie may be the truth, and is the truth to you. I remember I could not convince by telling a friend that a certain street lay so and so in a certain part of town, and he was wroth with me for contradicting him, but I took him to where it was and proved it did not lay as he believed it did. His idea was the Truth to him, and would have remained so, if he had not been taken there and proved otherwise, and for me to argue against his opinion before this, was in error, because he was satisfied in his own conscience, and concerning this kind of an argument was referred to by Jesus when he said, "agree with thine adversary whiles thou are in the way with him."

The people as a Religious body are forever worshipping Jesus, as some worship Mrs. Eddy, and so for this reason they cannot bear any fruit, because they worship the thing, instead of that thing left as an example, since, he nor she are anything to be worshipped, because Truth is not the work of indivduals. Science teaches us that we must experience and do likewise, and not worship things, or that we cannot worship God, but must experience Thought as God is Thought, and will be Thought, whether the mortal thinks so or not, and this IS KNOWLEDGE, because it is experienced Thought, and therefore "THE RESURRECTION," from a Lower to a Higher—Heaven—conception of Life.

We observe Easter and Christmas, and make holidays for this and that birthday, and "Decoration" day, when they are no more to observe than

yours and mine. It fails to build us like the EXAMPLE when we simply worship such persons and observe the days; besides, you and I are fighting the battles for an existence, and tho it is not with "bullets," it is as hard a fought battle as in war. It is a war in one sense of the word, and really a more upright battle than fought as we sometimes fight—for the good of a few, and the reward can only be an existence for us, as it is for them, and we are heroes as they are heroes. No wonder Christmas, birthdays and the like have grown to be a matter of business only. All forms of "custom" fall into the rank and file of business, showing as it does, not any real regret for the past, and those gone before, but a pleasure mostly to those of the present—a case of selfishness only in its significance. If, instead of building monuments to this and that person, we would build our own characters equal to that person or cause,—then would we build monuments that are not only good to look upon and to be remembered, but that are everlasting ("My words shall live"), for, nothing can destroy True character and Truth, while the monuments built of stone, well,—"there shall not be left here one stone upon another." So, Religion is really hindering persons, as a rule, to live and seek the Truth, because it only OBSERVES and WORSHIPS the life that should be lived, since many of the leaders of many Religions fall under the bann of sin, and that is why we find fault with Religion generally. The most complete memory and monument you should have and build for Lincoln, is to live the life and principle he taught and lived,

and not to think that by observing his birthday and building monuments, and talking about the good HE DID, will build up the same for you. We say, "for Jesus' sake amen," when we ought to do it for our sake. Many grand and beautiful architectural structures in the way of Churches and monuments have been and are builded by money illegally as well as legally gained, and worshipped because the ignorant seem to think a structure could not stand unless it was built "in the name of God." While we can use and do need a building where we can lecture and discourse on religious subjects pertaining to Christianity or the Truth, it need not be construed into a fact that such must be a KIND of Temple or Building. There is not a KIND of Truth. Refer back to what Paul said, that "YE ALL SPEAK THE SAME THING, THAT YE BE PERFECTLY JOINED TOGETHER IN THE SAME MIND, AND IN THE SAME JUDGMENT." You make it a KIND of Truth, or a Creed or a Sect, when you erect a building for this or that, which is very nicely illustrated in Matthew 24: 2. It says,— "And Jesus went out and departed from the temple; and his disciples came to *him* for to shew him the building of the temple. "And Jesus said unto them, See ye all of these things? Verily, I say unto you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." These stones representing false doctrines or many creeds are not laid upon the foundation of Truth, so the buildings of such doctrines or stones shall be rent from their places when the real Knowledge of "What is Truth?" shall be known.

We will now take up the subject of the birth of Jesus, because there has been so much said in regard to it—so much misconception, which has formed the idea of his being the "immaculate conception," or as Mrs. Eddy says that he was "born of God and Mary." This, too, has given chance to form different religious views, and build monuments to the dead—doctrine of these views. Coming into the sense and reasonableness of all Creation, which is but the form of development of things to their fulness, and not that they "WERE CREATED BEFORE THEY GREW," we cannot or should not conceive the idea of any miraculous thing being formed out of the ordinary law of things. If you believed in that Jesus produced "fish" and "bread" by which he "filled the hungry," then you too, believe in "fish stories," or that things can be formed out of the ordinary law of Time required to develop and manufacture them. However, I cannot believe the passage referred to should be taken in such a light as feeding with material food, and, if so, the people must have been "Wrapped up" in the teaching, to that extent they required but little material food. Anyway, we could not accept any such "doctrine" in this Scientific age unless we still have that same superstition that has been responsible for such doctrines. It being so many years since any record had been made of the life work of Jesus, it is possible that these remarks are the result of what the disciples seemed to hear and see, or they, like the remark concerning the fatherhood of Jesus, appeared to them "in a dream." To quote from Emerson here, is to give a hint as to how truly things are not what

they always seem to the naked eye and ear in a certain state of consciousness, and he here gives my idea of how things are made use of in deceiving the mortal sense.

He says, "Nature may be as selfishly studied as trade. Astronomy to the selfish becomes Astrology; psychology, mesmerism (with intent to show where our spoons have gone); and anatomy and physiology become phrenology and palmistry." This "intent to show where our spoons have gone" is significant of what we are trying thru psychology—mesmerism or spiritualism and the like beliefs to show where we are going, or that, we have been there and came back, since we are under such use of the term mesmerised to such a belief, and as well as the idea that "disease is only a belief." Astrologers would tell us that we are governed by this or that star—making some a fool, and others wise, and therefore no chance to rise up from under or above certain conditions we have been in; but I rather agree with Shakespeare when he said, "the fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves that we are underlings." But, of course, we are led to "believe" the "stars" have such to deal with us, so then we are subject to this belief, since we are subject to our thought which "in ourselves" IS ourselves also, and making us governed by "our stars" because of such a belief, but not because of any fault of the stars. The SEEMING miracles performed by Jesus were only to illustrate that Thought is Power in the Science of which it can be used, and if we look to them only according to the theory as miracles, or interpret the remarks made in the Bible as miraculous, we

can only see them as being caused by some Being. They should be looked upon as a case of mesmerism —an influence of the Power of Thought over the Mortal sense of sight, but as psychology, we view them from a Spiritual Sense working in a form of growth in Thought and Power over the Thought and Power of the Natural Sense. We are then drawn away from it as mesmerism because it is not to satisfy self, nor executed to create wonderment, as all growth of the psychological in changing things is the result of Time required in which to make this change which cannot be made on the instant, any more than the physical growth can be made at a moment's notice as assigned to "the loaves and fishes." The first miracle performed by Jesus could not have been done as a direct part, or caused by the Will of Thought as applied to God, or in the Sense of Good, and illustrates the idea of how one works even at the expense of a falsehood to uplift mankind. The miracle referred to is "the water changed to wine," which was not changed, but the Mental state of those present was changed, and for a purpose. It is barely conceivable that the law of Good—Thought in the name of God which is supposed to destroy the law of appetite and passion, and all things contrary to promote happiness, should HERE BE IN the VERY ACT of producing the effect of that which it aims to destroy. This passage simply illustrates how easily man under the bond of sin and ignorance and superstitious persons are so much more subject to deception than one having viewed things from a Scientific point of view.

We cannot but admire some of the ancient characters, especially those who professed to be "MAGICIANS." The work of these men was studied to some advantage even by their opponents, and perhaps one of the greatest of these was Virgil, of whom I quote the following,—

"Virgil, the Magician, is the character in which the great Roman Poet presented himself to the popular imagination of the middle ages. The origin of this singular delusion may be thus explained. From a very early period—almost, we may say, from the age in which he flourished—Virgil was acknowledged to be the prince of Latin Poets.

"His poems threw all others in the shade, and this, not so much because they exhibited a finer and more original genius, as because their style was perfect, the subject of his *magnum opus* thoroughly national, and his immense historical and antiquarian lore devoted to the glorification of the Roman people. From him the grammarians selected the examples of their rules, and even composed treatises on special questions suggested by his poems. The rhetoricians, too, found their material for their themes and declamations, and the later poets imitated his phraseology.

"Very soon the idea sprung up that in his verses there lay hidden quite a peculiar wisdom and mystic meaning. Thus it happened, that as early as the 3d and 4th centuries, even Christian authors had contracted the habit of regarding him reverentially, a feeling which in its turn induced them to use him polemical, or at least for theological purposes.

"Hence they sought to prove the beginning of the fourth Eclogue a Messianic prediction, and would have it that Virgil foresaw the day of Christ. This view rooted itself so deeply, that Virgil and the Sibyl were actually introduced into the liturgy of the Church, along with the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, and in the 'mysteries of the middle ages' are frequently cited as bearing witness to a coming messiah. Furthermore, when the first ages of polemical theology arrived, biblical critics and controversialists did not hesitate to quote the verses of Virgil in elucidation of passages of scripture, and in confirmation of their views."

The reason the above quotation is presented here in connection with the birth of Jesus, is not so much so that it has any bearing with his birth, but to show the interest taken in such persons having the knowledge and power to deceive and influence those who are ignorant and religiously superstitious. It is because of this that it was easy to write then concerning an "immaculate conception" and have the people believe it. We can with Reason then, conclude that Jesus was under the same Law of formation as we, and all other formations, consequently, not an "immaculate conception," for there are no "miracles" under the name of Law and Order. In view of this as the only means of Natural formation, it is hardly permissible that the birth of Jesus should be viewed in any other light than a son to Joseph and Mary, tho there can be OPINIONS to the contrary. It was NO SIN for Mary to "be with child," tho in the Bible she is called a "virgin," simply be-

cause in those days they called women virgins who lived under certain beliefs held by the Church, and men were "priests," for it was "the chief priests" in the Church who opposed the teaching expounded by Jesus, that said "crucify him." No doubt this is the reason Jesus taught against this religious doctrine, because, when he had reached the age of maturity, he had learned of his birth and why his mother left the Church and country, where she was afterwards sought and found with "the child in a manger." It was then that Joseph, who, no doubt, was a priest, was troubled in his Conscience, as was also Martin Luther, and also left the Church and followed Mary. This state of, not only a guilty Conscience is illustrated in Matthew, tho it is written so as to lay no blame on the Church, as well as to keep the people in ignorance, but also that no shame be passed on the character of one who wished to uphold what she had believed sacred.

It says,—"Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. "But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream." It is amusing to read what a "JUST MAN" Joseph was, but rather, how he wished the truth to be withheld from the public if possible, and how ALL MEN have ever since been "JUST," or that their character could never be ruined, but for women, well; she could have no character remain after such an experience. But times are changing, and the character will be looked upon by all alike, besides, a child, no matter how it

came in the world, if it be healthy and mature into usefulness, there will be no stain upon it, since, like all acts of Nature, it is the result of that act, tho its elders may be held up to ridicule. Nature is no respecter of persons, any more than "God is no respecter of persons," or Thought is no respecter of persons. So then, it gives the idea that it "appeared in a dream" to Joseph, but as nearly three hundred years had passed since the birth of Jesus, before any record was made concerning his birth, it is easy to understand how and why the writer of this epistle could and should make such a statement in order to lay no blame to Religion. Rather strange that the other sons and daughters born to Joseph and Mary should not have been born likewise. But it is out of the question to consider any other conception than the regular course under the Law of Nature. I can conceive the idea that "virgin" here, simply signifies purity of Thought above other women of her time, because of a desire to be the mother of "the Christ" to be born in that period as prophesied. This Thought could here be held in Conscience, and the child would take on such a condition of Thought as the Conscience developed to that state of maturity. This is proof to some extent because she left the Church that the child might be born and influenced by such environments, and because she entertained more of a Higher Ideal of what A Christian Life should be than the Christian life taught by the Church.

The earth is the receptacle of the seed, as the Natural Law of increasing or multiplying, which will produce its kind; so likewise is the woman the

receptable of the seed which will produce its like,—the sex of the child being determined by the Law that governs the order of formation. I argue then, that Jesus was born of Joseph and Mary, but Christ, which is but the Idea of a Spiritual Creation was and is born of God, because it is a Thought. Jesus most always looked to God as the Father—Thought—and this is why it was very easy to hold to the opinion that he was an "immaculate conception," or "born of God," or, as Mrs. Eddy says "born of God and Mary." He said "Call no man on the earth your Father, for one is your Father, even God," which is not in evidence to-day, nor a recognition of the same, let alone, that ignorant generation. He could not say with profit: "call no one on the earth your mother," any more than he could profit by saying "call no man on the earth your Father," if it was not to hold the Spiritual View of Life instead of the Natural conception of life. Again, why did Jesus say "call no man on the earth your Father," when HE KNEW that there was such? if it were not but TO CHANGE OUR BASE OF THOUGHT from a Natural, to a Spiritual conception of Life. But how can we read Luke 1: 26, 27, and still remain under this cloud of ignorance as to the marriage of Joseph and Mary, and a father and mother to Jesus? It reads,—"And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, "To a virgin *espoused* to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary." What better evidence do we or can we wish as authority, than what is here written to the fact that Mary—

she a virgin—was married—"ESPOUSED"—to Joseph? It plainly signifies here that Mary, like all women after a certain length of time or six months, or in the "sixth month," was in a pregnant state, or "with child." Again, I say it came to her during her marriage to Joseph that the child now in its "sixth month" was to be the Jesus that should reveal Christ, or the Spiritual Idea which was to be lived in the world then as much as possible, and by continued Thought respecting the same, it shall finally be the One Life. This conscious state of Spirituality or Mentality with Mary, was due to her past life of Virginity—Purity of Thought, which enabled her to receive the Divine Conception, and afterwards mother it in the form of Jesus. We can also conclude from this that the foundation is laid for Good and Evil during the development of the embryo, therefore it behooves the mother to look to her Mental realm for any deficiency which may dwell there. So it is very evident that the Spiritual Conception of "the Christ" that should be BORN to Jesus, and BORNE by him after he reached the age in which he could impart it to the people was due to his ever recognition of the same during his early life.

After reading the remarks in Luke 1: 26 and 27, where it gives the marriage of Joseph and Mary, BEFORE Jesus was born, as just mentioned,—how ridiculous are the remarks in Luke 1: 34 and 35, or just following the former, since one seemingly denies the other. But the significance of the two verses first mentioned alludes to Jesus—the Natural and Physical form now being in its sixth month, due to her marriage as it says, with Joseph,

while the following 34th and 35th allude to Christ —the Spiritual and Mental Idea to be received by Mary during her pregnant state. It reads: "Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, *seeing I know not a man?* And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come unto thee; and the power of the highest shall over-shadow thee; therefore also that holy *thing* which shall be born of thee,—shall be called the Son of God." The italics are mine. Note, it calls it a "thing," or not necessarily a person, and we like Mary "NEED TO KNOW NOT A MAN" in order to receive it as Mary received it. The remark: "it is born"—conceived by Mary, or given as coming from her, or born of woman, is because the word woman signifies a sending forth, or as that which gives out, or it comes from such a source, because Jesus came from such, as all multiplication is from such a source. To repeat; how ridiculous is the latter remark made by Mary, —"How can this be, when I know not a man," when, in the verse previous to this remark, it claims Mary and Joseph were married—"ESPOUSED."

There is too much custom and formality existing in the world to-day, by which Religion is formed, so that, we are rendering "the things that be of Cæsar," rather than "THE THINGS THAT BE OF GOD." We should not be chastised nor criticised if we do not, as the Church has and does uphold and behold the form of Mary in her virginity, since Jesus, her son, never looked to her in the light of so great a personality. In reality, he rejected her always, as pointed out heretofore,

and also in the following,—as given in Luke 2: 48 to 50.

"And when they saw him, they were amazed, and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing." Note here that Mary calls Joseph the "father" of Jesus, with the same respect that she alludes to herself as mother. "And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business? "And they understood not the saying which he spake unto them." And what was and is the "Father's business," but the Thought's business, or his Thought's business if the Thought is the same Thought either as represented by you or Jesus? The word "also" in that part of the sentence where it says, "therefore also that thing," signifies that there must have been something else, which is the form of Jesus in its embryotic state, while the "thing" must refer to what was to be born in connection with the form of Jesus.

Here we find that with all the supposed spiritual belief which Mary contained, she was not able to "understand" the words which Jesus "spake" unto her about HIS "Father's business"—Thought's business. Paul's comprehension was much better than conceived by Mary, as he said,—"Though we have known Christ AFTER THE FLESH, yet henceforth know we him no more." In other words, It is to be lived in the Spirit, instead of "after the flesh" HERE, as the words of Paul signify not to be "known"—lived—after the flesh here.

In prophesying the coming of Christ, or the person who should reveal a Higher Life than lived then and the present,—it did not say who should reveal it, but that it would be known who that person was, by the character of one of those born in that day. Mary seemed to be the one in her own mind, tho it is recorded that in those days others, who were "with child," went before "the magistrate" to know if the child to be born of them should be "the Christ" representative. But Mary, above all others, recognized the condition under which the mother and child should be, therefore, the "Angel" in the form of Thought came to her, regardless of what the Prelate should say or dictate.

Having learned then, that God is Thought, and the Soul is Sense, in the light that a Sense of this life to be reached, is thru a Sense of Thought or God as Power over and above the Natural Condition we arrive at what "the resurrection" is, or that The Knowledge gained is "the resurrection" referred to. So then, when the final State of Visible Immortality shall be reached, there will then be "no marriages," because people shall be as the "Angels of God in heaven," which is the Highest Conception of Life that can be reached. Judging from the condition of the world to-day and in the past,—it will be thousands of years before this realization can be made. But, if it has been millions of years in bringing about the Natural State of Evolution, we shall, and should not consider more of the future than is reasonable, since, "no man knoweth, not even the Son, what God hath prepared for them that love him." In

other words, it is impossible for the "Son," which is merely an Act of the Word of God in the form of Thought cannot conceive what Thought will develop into, since It cannot be "prepared" by Thought until conceived in its fulness or finished work, and those who "love him" are merely the attributes of this Thought as it works to an end, since, you and I have failed to even understand, and therefore "love" It, because of living after the flesh, therefore, we cannot fully "love him," for, it is the work of God. So, by the Evolution of Thought will be brought about the Spiritual State of an existence.

To quote Jesus again: "For, behold, the days are coming, in the which they shall say, Blessed ARE the barren, and the wombs that never bare, and the paps which never gave suck." Emerson says "Marriage (in what is called the spiritual world) is impossible, because of the inequality between every subject and every object. The subject is the receiver of God-head, and at every comparison must feel his being enhanced by that cryptic might." Whatever might be his opinion of "the spiritual world," it is hardly permissible that Emerson believed in "another world." So his statement here in what—as he says is "CALLED" the Spiritual world, simply expresses his idea to the fact that it would be impossible for anything of two distinct ideas to form any alliance with each other. And so it is, as I have pointed out,—impossible for there to be any marriage when that State of Thought pertaining to One Life as God is reached, or, "the inequality between every subject and every object," or as

Jesus says there shall be no marriages when all are as "the angels of God in heaven." When there is only one condition of Thought, which is God, there can be only one God and Man, or Man as God. So then, marriage is given "by permission"—"he doeth well" but not "by commandment"—"he doeth better," for, both the Spiritual and Natural Condition must exist until the Spiritual is declared by Thought or God to be the Only Life, and of a certainty, the Spiritual Life cannot be exclusively lived while both the Spiritual and Natural are lived. While, "marriage is a failure" to many who seek it in the wrong, it is also a blessing to those who seek it in the right, yet, "in the flesh ye shall have trouble." Jesus did not speak much on marriage, and when he did, it was on parable lines, or very obscure. He knew it required Time for "Nature to work to her own end," as all Perfection is based on Time. But I predict there shall be an end to Time, when Perfection is reached, because there will then be no use for Time.

In Matthew 19: 7 and 8 we read,—"They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? "He saith unto them, Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so." The law of divorce given by Moses, gives an idea of how the average mortal stood in those days, because of man's brute nature—the sexual indulgence of desire—and the same which Christ aims to destroy. Perhaps the last reference made by Jesus in regard to marriage, and which is the most important of them all, will be found in Matthew,

as well as the other Apostles, because it gives "the resurrection" and marriage together. "The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection, and asked him, "Saying, Master, Moses said, If a man die, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife and raise up seed unto his brother. "Therefore, in the resurrection, whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her. "Jesus answered and said unto them, ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. "For in the resurrection, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. "And when the multitude heard THIS, they were astonished at his doctrine."

The Sadducees were nearer the Truth in one sense of the word than those who were "astonished at this doctrine," for, like the doubting Thomas, the questions of the Sadducees brought forth the "doctrine" that the thing to know, was "the power of God"—Thought to raise man up to a Higher Life then and there. Thru the questions of the Sadducees we will find that "the resurrection of the dead," are not the dead as we have always BELIEVED, and in fact, does not refer to man directly, but indirectly, as heretofore explained. Now the Sadducees were very anxious to know the facts, and so, they brought out all the above as relating to THEMSELVES, or, THOSE

PRESENT THEN AND THERE, as we would do NOW in asking about the life which concerns us. Therefore, it was a DIRECT QUESTION, and the reply should have been a direct reply, or refer to those present, as it should be if we asked the question concerning us. But, NOTE THE REPLY,—"In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage." Whereas, had it been intended for THOSE PRESENT, or FOR US, it should read YOU, instead of "THEY neither marry nor are given in marriage." It follows then, that "they" as used in the place of the word you, refers to a certain period, or generation, or future, or "hereafter," or beyond the then and now present time, and not to you, nor to those asking the question. But because Jesus said "THEY neither marry nor are given in marriage," it is easy to understand how the word "they" can be ignorantly interpreted, because of the remark,—"They all had her" is given. But, if this latter remark is taken in such a light of a hereafter for those present, and us, or concerning them and us, or those who marry, or THOSE WHO ARE SINGLE WHILE LIVING DURING THE MARRIAGEABLE ERA, or as two conditions as then and now are present,—it should be sentenced when reading, "God is not the God of the dead but of the living," for, the Sadducees remarked that "THEY WHO HAD HER WERE DEAD," just as we remark about the dead and believe they or we shall live forever, or be "resurrected." We are living in that age referred to in Revelation 20: 5, saying, "This is the first resurrection," because this is the beginning—"first"—knowledge of what the resurrection signifies.

Having convinced you—aimed to at least, that "Angels" are not necessarily individuals, nor masculine and feminine, but, that Angel is a term to Express God in the form of Thought, therefore, the same, or a synonym,—we can conclude that "the angels of God in heaven," when speaking of the resurrection and marriage, is the Highest Conception of Life that can be reached, and "they neither marry nor are given in marriage," because THEY—people who have reached the same State as "They" the "Angels" cannot marry since they are in One Condition of Thought, which is "God in heaven." I wish to repeat that those who are able to "overcome the world" as Jesus and Paul taught, while living in the marriageable Era, are under the Natural and Spiritual Law of Death and Life as Jesus and Paul were, and all during the Natural condition, but that "ALL MEN" shall be even as "I am," is, or refers to the end of the Natural condition—"end of the world." So then, the State of Immortality will, of course, be in the "hereafter" HERE, because it is not true here to-day.

It has always been a wonder to me how Mrs. Eddy could entertain the idea as I do, or that "the time is coming when there shall be no marriage"—this—a copy of her remark—and yet cling to the idea that she, or any of us who are now living, shall continue to live, after what is termed death, or the death of that person. Her two terms are contradictory, that is,—to claim there shall be no marriage here, and claim that we continue to exist, is to throw those who do not marry in a different state than we, when ALL people—"they"

—are referred to as the same, or the passage is directed to all persons, or refers to a time and period when all persons are of the same Thought—God. Such a State then, throws us of to-day as in no way connected with a future life, other than that we are PARTAKERS of the same life NOW, and therefore a HELP as in all walks of life to that or this State in the future by having "PART in the resurrection"—SOME of the Knowledge of a Higher Life. You can or ought to be able to see clearly that Mrs. Eddy cannot, nor you cannot link the two ideas together. It therefore proves that she is unable to explain WHY "there shall be no marriage," and still hold the idea good as to herself and her followers living hereafter, or that they continue to exist in the form of Spirit by saying HERE,—"Man is Spiritual and not Material." If she used the term, "I am Spiritual and not Material," that would be in harmony with the Truth, because the "I am" is significant of "the Christ"—Mental or Spirit I have alluded to heretofore, but will quote it here again. "Ye are not of the world, even as I AM not of the world, I and my Father are one," because the I am and Thought—Father are One, which refers to all alike by the words,—"ye are not of the world," because of the Unity of Thought—God. He referred to the opposite or Mental and Spirit when he said at another time "ye are of your Father the Devil," that is, the Unity of Thought is the Father of Evil, and therefore both Good and Evil—God and Satan—Spiritual and Natural is a condition we are all under. But for the article I recently read in a newspaper concerning her idea of marriage,

I should not have mentioned the above. The article said, "Regarding marriage Mrs. Eddy never interferes with any individual's discretion in this matter except when she believes the person unfit for this step. Marriages are common in the Christian Science Church." This, of course, is not a remark made by Mrs. Eddy, but upheld by her followers and even Mrs. Eddy, since it was not contradicted by her, as it should have been when it came to her notice, if she had not been in sympathy with it. The above article was published because of her idea in regard to marriage which had been assaulted by other denominations. If then, she believes marriage is only for those who are fit to be (she is correct here in my opinion, as long as the conditions are favorable to Natural Law) SHE HERE ENTIRELY DENIES the teaching of Jesus in that he said "they neither marry nor are given in marriage"—not claiming here that it is only intended for those who are "unfit." In other words, her remarks refuse to accept the idea that Jesus "overcome the world"—sexual indulgence, as AN EXAMPLE, and that the TRUE FOLLOWERS should in Time, or at some future Time, do likewise, also, making Jesus and Paul "unfit" for the marriageable state, because they did not marry. It is also a slur on those who profess to be Christian Scientists in case they are able to overcome, and so do not marry, since they would be held up to ridicule, because it infers they are "unfit" to do so. That "marriages are common in the Christian Science Church" is no wonder, and is true because it could not be otherwise in that Church, any more than any other, nor those

outside of the Church, since, it is a Law of the Natural Condition, which also proves the religious teaching is like all Religion in that it evades, to some extent the Truth Scientifically put. Marriage is proper, because it "becometh us to fulfil all righteousness"—right until a better condition is reached, since Error is sometimes imperative until Truth renders itself Absolute. Do not imagine Jesus said "be of good cheer," just to console you to the fact that he "overcome the world" FOR YOU, but that you should "be of good cheer" to know that you should aim to "overcome the world" likewise.

In connection with marriage,—there is no word that has been so much misused, or I might better say abused, as the word "Love." "Ye shall love one another" refers to an act of Good. The word "affection" applies more to marriage than the word Love, however, we will use the latter here out of respect to marriage. "God is Love," or Love is Thought, denote a condition of Thought that cannot be applied to marriage. People are bound to respect and Love each other irrespective of marriage. We hear because a man and woman falls in love, they become married. But, this is not a fact, because love here is connected with passion, as Meredith wrote, "We can live without love, what is passion but pining." I claim "Love at sight," is passion Right, because it too, cannot uphold the common view of love in that we are supposed to be in company with each other for some time in order to entertain a feeling of love for each other. I say, He that is married, but looketh upon another woman, saying, "I have

found my affinity," hath only lost his love of passion for the other, since love, or passion, dieth when it cannot further seek its own. Therefore, affection could be more properly used in applying to a feeling that should exist between man and woman, while it may also be used to express a fondness between mother and child, yet, the word Love, properly used shows more of its meaning because if you respect your child, you will do an act of Love, or an act of God. We get this idea in the following passage,—"Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the Sons of God, therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not." We learn from the remarks made by Jesus, and also experience, that the heart is more capable of "evil thoughts, murder, adulteries," etc., than of Love, which former is guided more by the brain and nerve, as in the animal, therefore Natural, while the latter is that which is of God because it is Good. Tho the dictionaries have classed the word love with the word affection, I cannot agree that they are the same in the true Sense of expression. When referring to "God is Love," Paul says, "But the fruit of the Spirit is Love." But he refers to the opposite, or "affection" when he says,—"And they that are Christ's, have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." The animal shows even such signs, and they know nothing of what ought to be termed Love, or God in the Sense of Higher things, or have no Mind of their own, but is also a sign of selfishness, for, as a rule they only protect their own. We are becoming less selfish, because we are growing away

from nature, yet, we are unable to see this growth. It is hidden in the fact tho, by occasionally reading of where "learned men" have expressed certain views, tho criticised and called "unhumanitarian" because they have said "older women" are not to be looked after so much as the young. But I predict the time is coming when these "older" persons, as well as some others not in health, will lose their selfish view to that extent they will be glad to depart by some easier death—ask to be relieved by some potion—than to wait until a crippled age, or an incurable disease has relinquished them from their present difficulty, for, as Jesus says, "It would be better if that man had never been born." The selfish desire to remain with their people will be outgrown by the fact that they have run their full course in being a benefit to the race, and so, depart in peace, rather than depart when nature alone has its day.

People talk of the selfishness of others, when there is not one of us but entertains a part in selfishness in some form or another. Show me a non-selfish person, and I will show you the end of the world. I read an article recently written by a Minister in which it said "the selfish person is a worse person to reform than a criminal." If he had but reflected on himself he could have discovered just what he referred to—"the selfish person," for we can readily detect in the man working to receive a "reward in heaven," the worst form of selfishness, since, he would not be working for the cause if it were not for what he expected to receive in the future, yet, I believe some are a

little doubtful, because many to-day are working more for the monetary end of it.

Perhaps a very suitable way to illustrate affection—commonly called love—or that the feeling between the male and female is not necessarily love, but passion, is to show where it is liable to end, especially if they are demonstrative in their affection, as shown in the caress or embrace. If a man be addicted to drink, and you give him a glass of wine, he may not feel the effect of it, but let him continue the drink one after another, and the result will be a case of intoxication and perhaps evil results, which is a lesson in most cases that the first one should be avoided. So, with embracing and kissing,—the kiss contains the ingredient of desire to satisfy self in some form or another, and will, if continued, grow into an evil desire when practised by the opposite sexes, and in many cases, result in evil, tho once may not bring the effect. This again, is proof that it is not "of the Spirit," but is "of the flesh." There is no better teacher than experience, and I aver that there is no difference in the experience of all men and women, tho some, to avoid conviction, claim they could not experience such feelings thru such processes, but I acknowledge my experience is no more than some others, or those who would not admit the truth.

If my heart is made sore by the loss of a friend, business, or property, it is because I too am selfish, and I have experienced and expect to experience these things, just as Jesus "wept" on certain occasions. Yet, in reality I have no loss, for I am not the original cause of such things, but am under

two laws of creation, and can use only what is necessary, therefore, they—these things do not belong to me. This reminds me of the story of a tramp who was lying on the ground in a villa, when he was approached by "the Lord" of the place and asked to "vacate." The tramp asked "who does this belong to," at which the Master replied, "it is my estate." The tramp asked "how did you come into possession of it." He replied, "I inherited it from my father." How did he get it. He and his men fought for it. The tramp began removing his coat, and at the same time remarked, "Let's fight for it." If the mother weeps for the loss of a child, she is doing so thru a lack of knowledge of the law of Creation and things in their order of destruction. Jesus referred to this when he said,—"Follow me and let the dead bury the dead." The mother looks at the child as HER OWN, and of a necessity weeps for HER OWN,—but knowing the child belongs to the law of Creation and formation, and therefore ITS OWN, she has no real authority for weeping. So I say, he that goeth about weeping over a lost wife, is only making it easier for the next one—the sympathetic woman hath a large heart, and she "falls" for the same selfish-sympathy that is within the man, for all such love is more or less selfish, which is derived from Nature. Sympathy is a poor substitute for an act. Some persons feel "hurt" if you never sympathize with them. Sympathy never filled the hungry, nor cured the sick and sinful.

Let us turn here to what extent love in nature may be used, or that, where love for a child may

be removed, if, at any time, the selfish nature demands some other form of love in nature, by quoting from Spencer.

"Great love of offspring is ascribed to the New Guinea people,—and yet a man will "barter one or two" with a trader for something he wants. Eyre states that the natives of Australia are characterized by strong parental affection,—and yet, besides being said to desert sick children, Agnas asserts of them that on the Murray they will sometimes kill a boy to bait their hooks with his fat. Of the Fuegians we read that they are affectionate towards each other,—and yet that in times of scarcity they kill the old women for food. Keeping this in mind, we shall be aided in reconciling the conflicting accounts of his excessive egotism, and his fellow feeling—his cruelty and kindness." While this quotation shows "excessive egotism," it illustrates this in a hereditary form in us, because we know of such cases of extreme kindness in one instant, and of extreme cruelty in another instant being practised by the same person on another, and that the same can be improved—not by satisfying self—but by looking to a Higher Ideal of Life as our existence, irrespective of what concerns ourself.

Jesus said,—"And every one that hath forsaken father, or mother, or wife, or children, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life." This has given rise to the opinion that man should leave his wife, etc., or that it even refers to a separation by divorce. It simply alludes to the fact that if we give up the religious opinion held by our "forefathers," or

as being in no way related to them only by association for a cause as in nature it must be so, such would open the way to receive the Knowledge of a Higher Life than is revealed by Nature, because it would denote unselfishness in us, and so not relate to the natures of man generally. By giving up such past theories of a life "hereafter," which is "of the flesh"—the opinion derived from the selfish view of "father, mother," etc.,—we receive—"inherit everlasting life" HERE. That is, we "inherit" as much as we are able to receive and use here. We, in the same way "inherit" money for the Physical part of life, only in the proportion that we are able to use it here, since it can only be used here. If the above referred to separation, or divorce, it would contradict the saying,—"For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall CLEAVE TO HIS WIFE."

The only thing then to do is to affirm the Truth only, that only the Truth shall appear by Manifestation, therefore, it is God—Man—who affirms its own, as also it would be Satan—man—who affirms its own. So I am in one sense Temporal, "Nevertheless I live, yet NOT I, but Christ liveth in me,"—and I live, yet not I, but Satan liveth in me, therefore "I am" God and Satan. But when I "pass away"—die, Then I can be nothing, because I—form cannot express either life, since, I shall be NO FORM OF LIFE.

Jesus said "Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." In other words,—to

speak against me as the Son of man, as we talk of one another, will not affect me as to my morality or immorality, since I am affected by my own thoughts, and therefore, leaves nothing in its true sense to be "forgiven," or "it shall be forgiven," because I am not subject to what is said against me— "the Son of man"—because there can be no conviction, or I cannot be condemned within myself from what is said of me. But to speak against the "Holy Ghost," which is "The Comforter," is to lessen the followers of Truth, and so, cannot "be forgiven," or overlooked in "this world" because it THEN AND THERE HINDERS the work of God—Thought—in "this world," and "in the world to come," since, "the world to come" CANNOT COME—be present in this world—unless the Truth is recognized in "this world," and so cannot "be forgiven," because sin cannot be forgiven, but should be abolished, when it is THEN AND THERE forgiven, because it is destroyed, but not that it is forgiven. Some will remark by way of excuse,—"How could Jesus have done such mighty works if he was not born of God?" To this ignorant remark, we can reply, "there have been men before and since his time who lived at some time—Paul, for instance—very far from what is right, yet their recognition and understanding of a Higher Life and Power of Thought, have enabled them to do "many wonderful things"—seemingly, if not a fact. If this were not true, then there would be no help for man to rise above Evil conditions, since ALL have erred, even Jesus. To make ourself equal to the Truth he taught, is to make ourselves "equal to

God," and this is the only "Salvation," but, the average man cannot entertain the idea of a Spiritual Life here, because he has failed to recognize the fact that he is only equal here to whatever he believes, therefore, their likeness to the Jews in the time of Jesus. To repeat the words of Jesus,—"Is it not written in your law, I said ye are Gods?" making all men equal to God.

I predict then, that when man reaches that period —that is, "all men," or State called Spiritual Life which is the Complete Life or State of Perfection, that the propagation period—Natural and Spiritual jointly, or Physical and Mental jointly—will be that end, which IS, "the end of the world," but not the end of the world as referred to by Theologians and the public in general, for "I came not to destroy, but to save the world." As touching on such a state of existence, we will quote Matthew 19: 11 and 12. "But he said unto them all men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. "For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb, and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men, and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

In the above quotation we cannot evade the fact that, as in "Natural selection," of the Physical growth of existence, there is also a Spiritual selection in the Mental growth of existence. Not that there are Naturally and Spiritually any SPECIALLY SELECTED PERSONS, as in Religion there seems to be a tendency to believe

that God selects certain persons for that or this, or that some are especially selected to master others, or that they are to be educated above others, and therefore "favored," but, "God is no respecter of persons." Some are physically unfit as well as spiritually unfit, or naturally and mentally so, but not because of the individual or you is it necessarily so. We have "they to whom it is given," because "all men cannot receive this saying." And not that it is specially "given," or that certain persons are "selected" from among a group, but that it is given to those who "are able to receive it." You will note that there are three types of eunuchs. The first signifies an improper birth,—the second signifies one that is made so thru surgery, as in the case of man serving Rulers, etc. The third and most important one, signifies the operation being performed by Thought—God—as in the case of Jesus and Paul, referred to when Jesus had "overcome the world" —flesh—and Paul expressed in saying, "I wish all men were even as I am," and had power "OVER HIS OWN WILL"—natural will. He has made himself a "eunuch for the kingdom of heaven's sake," refers to one during the marriageable period so that others may follow after a like fashion. This is in evidence that man is finally to overcome, or give up such relations, for there would be no occasion to use this proverb,—man becomes a eunuch for the kingdom of heaven's sake—if such were not true, because it would make the passage NULL and VOID. I can fully understand as Paul did, why "THE NATURAL MAN"—married and single—"knoweth not the things that be

of God"—because such things are of Thought and not Natural, and so are "foolishness unto him, for they are spiritually discerned"—they are mentally discerned, while the "Natural man" looks always to the Physical or that which is Natural and so believes the Mental cannot, at least, in a measure control the Physical because "it is according to nature." It does not have any choice of men nor of women, as Mrs. Eddy and others seem to think, or as Mrs. Eddy says "God has been graciously fitting me." "It is God that worketh in you"—and has no thought of individual persons. Neither has Satan — Thought — any choice of men and women, because it is a Unity of Evil. So we cannot be "rewarded" nor "condemned" hereafter for what we as individuals do in a body, if it is "THEY"—God and Satan—"Good and Evil"—that "WORKETH IN YOU," yet, we are God and Satan because they work in us as a body. Robert Ingersoll similarly defined this when he said "man is but the soil in which good and evil grows." Here again let me remark that it is reasonable to believe the world has always existed in some form or other, that it shall always exist, ("I came not to destroy but to save the world"), and that it never had a "beginning," since space must always have been and is filled; that something cannot be made from "nothing," but that this something could exist as solids without having a beginning, from the very fact that existence cannot exist from non-existence, but is because there is a world existence. The only thing then, that has "a beginning" is Life, or "Motion"

in the form of life, because any other existence need have no beginning, because only A GROWTH CAN BE ASSOCIATED WITH A BEGINNING. After millions of years this could develop thru laying dormant by fermentation into different terms of life from the fact that by one body coming in contact with another body forms a growth of one body in another state, just as two acids placed together will produce another or one acid with no seeming relationship. It is a reasonable supposition that the wind having blown the leaves from one location to another, that there these took root and grew up different forms of forests or growths than what existed in this locality, because it is a known fact that the forests having existed here have been put to route by other growths of forests springing up in this locality, just as in all animal life and growth there is a tendency to, or one animal will put to route the other as is also the case of mankind. This is according to nature —the brute—and cannot have any part with what is termed a Mental Life concerning Higher things.

It is highly conceivable then that when Thought had developed into a state of Consciousness that there could begin to form a new condition of life, and this has been and is my aim to prove that this, i. e., "the beginning" of what constitutes God and Satan—"Good and Evil" as referred to in Genesis, and thru the development of such Thought of One Only will also be the overcoming of the other Thought and the world which is "THE END" of that world or worldly condition. This assertion places me on the level of what I think, which is the Thought, "I AM" also, and so to a certain extent

places me above the Natural condition. This has been in my experience so, and if it be in my experience so, then it is "the Truth" to me, tho it may not be the Truth to you, because it is not in your experience so. It is the natural belief of man, because he is "the natural man," that it—the Natural condition cannot be overcome, since, believing—thinking such—will make it such, for, as "ye believe, so be it done unto you." Belief is really all there is in what concerns life, yet, to believe in another life has nothing to do with another life hereafter concerning you, because YOU CANNOT THINK NOW for any life to-morrow, since Thought of to-day cannot work for the to-morrow, because the Thought to-morrow will work for itself. It is impossible to overcome a thing you believe as impossible. The "natural man" as in Religion he is taught has been foolish enough to believe that Jesus lived just to "overcome the world" for us, when we are all subject to the same laws. Neither can it be said with accuracy that Jesus always lived up to what is referred to as overcoming the world, since the natural man was so much more in evidence then, than it is to-day, but that his abstaining—"fasting"—for forty days from the same, illustrates the fact that it could be overcome then and now, at least to a certain extent, and thru this was he able to prophesy what he believed to be "The Truth," or the God-Thought would in Time destroy these conditions and necessarily bring about a different condition of life. But, as to the Reality of what that life should be, he knew not as he said,—"no man knoweth, not even the Son," other than what

Thought—"God hath prepared for them that love him"—would produce as a result of this thinking of the same. The teacher of a school is subject to the same as the scholars, and the scholars are subject to the same laws as the teacher. The teacher is only a teacher because of having made more of a study of the problem taught than the scholars to be taught. We lay great stress on all other problems and preach against all other forms of appetite, but avoid the Real Truth as Jesus taught, lest we convict ourselves. We preach against drink, tobacco and the like, when they should be the last to be considered, for, you may take your "dope" in the form of Tea, Coffee, Chocolate and the many forms of "drugs" necessary to alleviate a feeling or perhaps nervous condition that has been brought about by living "after the flesh." It is said by your best authorities that "Tea is the most injurious of any of the luxuries." Perhaps it does not affect one in the same way. You may be opposed to something because it does not agree with what you like, or the odor may be offensive to you, or you may be opposed to a "tobacco breath" as some one is opposed to an "onion breath," but, as Paul said, "to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean, to him **it is** unclean." But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." All reformers take the view that it is the work of God back of them when they wish to make laws against another body or party, but they should know it is the work of God in the individual, or that God should work in the "reformer" to destroy the Evil

in them, as God will work in the other body or party to destroy the Evil in them, and then the Evil will be destroyed, and not until then, because, perhaps the reformers have more damnable evils in them than in those in them whom they wish to make laws against. For my part, I am too much of an Evolutionist to be a Revolutionist or a Reformer, since, I do not believe that things can be entirely overcome during the individual's term of life, or, that a thing can be constructed in "SIX DAYS," that requires thousands of years to accomplish. Even Jesus was "a glutton and a winebibber" or, was called so because he "came eating and drinking," tho he may not have drank to excess. Some may say here,—"that was only a remark made by his enemies." How absurd of me to say to a man who is an absolute "abstainer,"—"you are a drunkard."

So then, if you find a man is a drunkard, etc., do not blame him, ("I condemn no man," are the words of Jesus), because he is condemned or not to that extent he is subject to that or this, for it is not he that is working, but a conditioned environment which he is subject to, as you are under bond to some like habit, since in you the Evil is working in some like form. Besides, the drink will condemn him, as the appetite in another form will condemn you then and there, and the drink and other habits formed are nothing compared to the One Real Evil Jesus referred to as the worst form.

Several years ago while traveling thru Pennsylvania I chanced to be in conversation with a traveling salesman who said: "I detest a drunkard

and everything connected with the liquor traffic." Later in the conversation he suggested that that night we "make the rounds." He was a married man but, of course, he, like many others, or reformers, only "detested" things concerning other people or that which did not interfere with his own so-called pleasure, and so one can imagine there are things other than liquor when abused that will "ruin a home." No wonder Jesus said to the then and now Pharisee, "O generation of Vipers: how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." It lies within us to overcome the things in us which are a detriment to us irrespective of what another believes is right or wrong for us. Paul said "WORK OUT YOUR OWN SALVATION," and you will be doing all that is required, because, others will see if there be any improvement in YOU, and the result will be more favorable than to force others to believe as you may see wrongly. Then will the manufacturer of this or that be put out of business, since there can be no sale for anything if there be no desire and demand. Take, for instance, in every problem of life,—the wild animals become extinct when the woods are cleared away to make room for more civilized conditions. They could not, nor would not breed under such conditions. The insects do not appear when there is nothing to breed from and attract them. Decayed matter and the like creates worms and the like. When the swamps and low lands are done away with, or used to better advantage, there will be no cause for the kind of insects which generally live and thrive there. When cleanliness is

THOROUGH, the house will have no room for the insects which would otherwise inhabit it. Fly-paper does not do away with existing conditions; it only attracts insects which exist because of existing conditions. Man is the only living creature having a Mind and Conscience, therefore it is only reasonable to believe that he is the only form of life that can exist forever, or not become extinct, for Thought or God is in the world, that man may be saved from death in the world. This state of existence is referred to in chapter 19, verse 7 of Revelation. "Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready." This is in recognition of the fact that man being Conscious of "the Christ"—"the Lamb is come"—and the Truth, which is "HIS WIFE," is ready to be wed—accepted by all persons, for "His wife hath made herself ready," and the "false bride"—Error—is divorced by the Truth. This State of existence is the "New heaven and the new earth" referred to in Revelation, while "The first heaven and the first earth were passed away," thru a better understanding of what heaven and earth signify, and the Thought of the same, as referred to in the FINAL chapter of Revelation.

We have found that the Principle of the Evolution of Thought is always the same, and since we, or if we know the Principle, we can work accordingly. And, since there is no other space in which it can exist, tho it needs no space as a Principle, it cannot or does not exist as a Reality until it is demonstrated so by Expression fully developed as a Reality. This makes "Predestination" a lie,

from the very fact that nothing can be predestined as a result, and that which now exists as a Reality, knows nothing of to-morrow which shall be a different Reality. That is, the candle as light, could not predestine the electric as light, tho the principle of light is the same; for the electric is a different light, therefore a different Reality, yet the candle as light was the only Reality of light in its day. "Thou lovedest me before the foundation of the world," is simply significant of a Principle or anything which cannot be seen by the eye as in Nature things are seen, since Thought, Spirit, Love, Right and Wrong, Good and Evil and Reason cannot be seen only as they are Expressed by the form of man which is man. Man—form is but the PENDULUM swaying as they—Good and evil works, and therefore not steadfast as One—God. He is, like all forms of life, a kind of "THIRD-PART" as referred to in Revelation.

If you did believe, or do believe in Predestination, you cannot have any hope for yourself, from the very fact that if God Predestined it SO AND SO, you would not change from a fool to anything better, or a different life, because you are so and so, or thusly. If you have been convinced or not of no Predestination, it is hoped also to convince you that there is no "Regeneration." You ought to be convinced of this, since, as stated, Evolution is by Thought, consequently, Thought cannot return, or there is no Thought to return, but IS, or the Thought of to-day cannot return and take the place of the Thought that IS, or is HERE, because only that Thought which is here can exist as Thought. It cannot return in something else

to-morrow, or be born in something else to-morrow, when it and that which did exist by it can go no place, because there is no place—space but as it exists as we see it, only that the body—material returns "to dust." If you have followed me in believing that Thought develops and exists, and man exists and evolves as the Thought exists and develops, then you cannot conceive the idea that ANYTHING RETURNS, as believed also by those who believe "Reincarnation," because we can here say again, that what IS NOW IS, and not that anything can return, or appear again in another form. For, as the leaf which returns to the earth to replace there the space made vacant by the next leaf, so you likewise—shall return to fill the space left vacant by that body which shall be born to Express this Life. I have only repeated the unselfish remarks made by Jesus in a different way, but the same meaning, and we should not consider the possible selfish remarks made by him, any more than those made by us, yet we are not responsible as individuals for the selfish remarks made, since we are the offspring of selfish remarks made, or those made by him,

We should not approve of looking back, or to the origin of things, only as a lesson in Evolution on a Physical basis in that it assists in finding the facts of a Spiritual Evolution.

So then, if this thinking of the present only, ("TAKE NO THOUGHT FOR THE MORROW"), and consequently of no God only as a present Thought and so no hereafter, sound unreasonable to my readers or that it can be termed

"INFIDEL,"—then I am an Infidel to you, which is no more than that you are an Infidel to me. If one aims to live the Christ life here, he or she may be an Infidel in name only, therefore, a Christian in Truth in one sense of the word. If one be called a Christian and have no such qualities as Christ, then he or she is a Christian in name only, therefore nothing in Christ, since the name of a thing does not give it its quality, but is qualified to be such by the character lived. But one cannot claim to be a Real Christian—Christ in Truth, because no man can live a Christ life, in its Absolute form to-day, and Jesus did not, because the word Jesus signifies the Natural Life, but finally "THEY" will "ALL be CHRIST'S'—many in the one name—Christ, and not man as Jesus. The Philosophy of Christianity is a Truth, just as the Philosophy of Socialism is a Truth, but you can no more be a Christian to-day, than you could be a Socialist, other than in name, since, there are many Socialists who if they had the opportunity would in this age of greed do what their opponents are doing, and all must be educated ALIKE in the natural world of living, as in the Spiritual world of living here. Therefore, one is a Socialist in name only, as the one is a Christian in name only. Socialism deals with the material and physical life and so is related only to the Natural Law, while Christianity deals with the Mental and Spiritual Life and so is related only to the Spiritual Law of Life. However, they are associated with each other because of the existing conditions. Christ deals with the Spiritual as related to the Mental working to destroy the organs of desire and appe-

tite, while the Socialist deals with the system of the distribution of profits, and that which concerns the body, instead of the Real Soul.

I argue that this is Mental Evolution because it is above the Evolution of man in the Physical. The latter or "man from a monkey,' very rightly derives its name from the beginning of formation with no Sense of Cause, and therefore no Cause for anything higher than its own until a Knowledge of this or that developed.

> "And it came to pass, when Jesus ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine. "For he taught them as *one* having authority, and not as the scribes."

What is "authority?" and how do we as a rule receive it? To be the author and authority of a given thing is TO KNOW, and to know a thing is to experience that thing, since you cannot be authority for anything you cannot prove. Jesus did not prove anything but what he experienced in life, and that is all any one should be expected to prove, and the only thing he had authority on. "The scribes" taught from mere "belief," as all Religious doctrines are generally taught from what is supposed to be a fact, and not that it is so thru experience. You preach there is a Hell; then we should demand that you go to the "bottom" and find it, and you preach there is a Heaven; then you should invent some scheme to find it, because it is no more than Reasonable that you "deliver the goods," if we are willing to make the purchase—"sacrifice" things to attain it. It will then be proved because you have "authority." We are

disgusted with buying "gold bricks" and "watered stock," only to find that we have been swindled. If I speak "as one having authority," it is because I can prove by actual experience what I do know, and not what I "believe," for I too, may believe something I do not know. So you too, should WAKE UP before it is too late to enjoy the Heaven you and others can make HERE to some extent, and not suffer the Hell you and others make here to some extent. If you will spend more time and money in this—your own country, "saving souls," as you call it, than in foreign "missionary" work; you will note BETTER RESULTS IN THE FOREIGN COUNTRIES, than you can experience to-day under the present system. If you "save yourself" as the people wanted Jesus to do when he was not in a position to experience and prove anything, the foreigner will have SOME AUTHORITY FOR BELIEVING YOU, or would have an EXAMPLE of the Truth. But when you represent a country that builds for war and fight,—LAND GRAB AND THE LIKE, you cannot expect to be the example of any Truth. They do not appreciate the idea that unless they "repent and reform," that they will "go to Hell," as we have tried and do preach to them, while we are doing more against what is termed a sin than they are doing. No wonder they return "EVIL FOR EVIL," which same is now cropping out in some of the foreign countries.

We spend more time and money to reach the IMPOSSIBLE, than for that which IS POSSIBLE HERE. "Everything is possible with God," but we find some things are impossible "with God"

if it has no connection with the Principle of Good. It all depends on how you use the word "possible." It is impossible for God to get Good out of Evil, but "everything is possible with God" is the Truth, because the Truth IS "WITH GOD."

So then, you may find fault with me because my fault is not yours, and not because I am at fault. The same doctrine Jesus taught is found fault with to-day, because we are as SELFISH AS THEY, or want to LIVE FOREVER. Does this not smack of selfishness in its worst form? It is as much as to say "if I had my way about things, no one else would live forever," which is analogous to the fact that there exists a class who keep this in vogue. We are just as selfish about our Religion as in other walks of life, and this is why it is not the true Doctrine, and therefore unscientific.

I will conclude by asking a reasonable hearing, at least from those who have sought and not found that which is elevating and satisfying. It only requires a few to keep the Truth from going into oblivion, as in the case of all Scientific truths until it has so far advanced above Error that the latter will have little sway. We hear what is said of this or that Religion having such a "large following," but it need not be construed into a fact that because one or other Religion has a large following, that it is necessarily the Truth, because Truth is generally better known by "the fewness of its followers." It is of no use, and of course, unreasonable to argue with those who are satisfied, for, to be satisfied is THE GREATEST THING IN THE WORLD, yet, it does not hold good that such is the Truth, since Jesus had to do things

that were not exactly as satisfactory as he wished them. Jesus said never to argue the Truth with any one satisfied, but take into consideration those who care to hear it, for, it is better to "AGREE WITH THINE ADVERSARY WHILES THOU ART IN THE WAY WITH HIM," since discord only breeds hatred,—and wise is that person who will not "GIVE THAT WHICH IS HOLY UNTO SWINE, LEST THEY TURN AND REND YOU," which is to signify that you make more enemies to talk that which is "holy" as you believe it to be so, to those who cannot receive it as you see it is so. The same fault is found with the Truth to-day as of old, but these must finally fall into the ONE rank of the ONE DOCTRINE, which is Christ as the Idea, and when "ALL" have this same Mind and Thought —God, then will be "the end," because "ALL" are "Christ's at his coming," instead of the "MANY CHRISTS"—Creeds who teach that Christ is to appear "AGAIN" in the form of Jesus as "the Christ."

"Then said Pilate to the chief priests and to the people, I find no fault in this man."

THE END.

In conclusion; and for this reason I have "authority," is because I have been alleviated from and overcome what are termed the worst forms of sin, and the appetite for liquor, tobacco, tea, coffee, and other "drugs" or "stimulants" necessary to relieve one who has been living "after the flesh" by daily making the following affirmation; since it is as necessary to have Mental food daily, as Natural food, for "man shall not live by bread alone."

According to the Truth, "I AM" God and Master here, therefore I have Power over the diseased and Natural conditions of life, because "I AM" Spiritual and not Natural, or "The Christ" Idea, which is not of the world.

"YE ARE," and I AM not of the world" signifies the same Idea, or as Paul says, "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: April 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 088 198 3